Flavian Poetry and its Greek Past

Edited by
ANTONY AUGOUSTAKIS

MNEMOSYNE SUPPLEMENTS MONOGRAPHS ON GREEK AND LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

BRILL

Flavian Poetry and its Greek Past

Mnemosyne

Supplements

Monographs on Greek and Latin Language and Literature

Editorial Board

G.J. Boter
A. Chaniotis
K.M. Coleman
I.J.F. de Jong
T. Reinhardt

VOLUME 366

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/mns

Flavian Poetry and its Greek Past

Edited by

Antony Augoustakis

BRILL

LEIDEN · BOSTON
2014

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Flavian poetry and its Greek past / edited by Antony Augoustakis.
pages cm – (Mnemosyne. Supplements ; volume 366)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-26648-3 (hardback : alk. paper) – ISBN 978-90-04-26649-0 (e-book)
1. Latin poetry–Greek influences. 2. Valerius Flaccus, Gaius, active 1st century. Argonautica. 3. Statius, P. Papinius (Publius Papinius)–Criticism and interpretation. 4. Silius Italicus, Tiberius Catius. Punica. 5. Martial–Criticism and interpretation. I. Augoustakis, Antony. II. Series: Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum ; v. 366.

PA6050.F57 2014
871'.0109–dc23

2013044704

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 978-90-04-26648-3 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-26649-0 (e-book)

Copyright 2014 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Global Oriental and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

patri meo, comiti optimo

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments xi
List of Contributors xiii
Texts and Translations Used xix
List of Abbreviations xxi

Introduction. Between Greece and Italy: Flavian Poetry and Its Traditions 1
Antony Augoustakis

PART I

FLAVIAN LITERATURE AND GREEK INTERTEXTS

Quis magna tuenti / somnus? Scenes of Sleeplessness (and Intertextuality) in Flavian Poetry 13
Arianna Sacerdoti

PART II

VALERIUS FLACCUS

When the Argo Met the Argo: Poetic Destruction in Valerius' *Argonautica* 33
Darcy Krasne

Aratus and the Aratean Tradition in Valerius' *Argonautica* 49
Cristiano Castelletti

Collective Speech and Silence in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius and Valerius 73
Simone Finkmann

Conflating Funerals: The Deaths of Idmon and Tiphys in Valerius' *Argonautica* 95
Marco van der Schuur

Civil War and the Apollonian Model in Valerius' *Argonautica* 113
Carey Seal

Dionysius Scytobrachion's *Argonautica* and Valerius 137
Daniela Galli

Valerius' *Argonautica* as an Ideological Epic of the Flavian Era 153
Irene Mitousi

PART III

STATIUS

Tragic / Epic: Statius' *Thebaid* and Euripides' *Hypsipyle* 171
Jörn Soerink

Greek Author, Greek Past: Statius, Athens, and the Tragic Self.......... 193
Jean-Michel Hulls

Polis, Court, Empire: Greek Culture, Roman Society, and the System of Genres in Statius' Poetry 215
Federica Bessone

Like Purple on Ivory: A Homeric Simile in Statius' *Achilleid* 235
Pavlos Sfyroeras

PART IV

SILIUS ITALICUS

Homeric Receptions in Flavian Epic: Intertextual Characterization in *Punica* 7 251
Evangelos Karakasis

Loyalty and the Lyre: Constructions of *Fides* in Hannibal's Capuan Banquets 267
R. Joy Littlewood

Meruit deus esse uideri: Silius' Homer in Homer's *Punica* 13............. 287
Michiel van der Keur

The Philosophy of Power: Greek Literary Tradition and Silius' *On Kingship* 305
Marco Fucecchi

PART V

MARTIAL

'Graece numquid' ait 'poeta nescis?' Martial and the Greek Epigrammatic Tradition 327
Margot Neger

Fingering Cestos: Martial's Catullus' Callimachus 345
Robert Cowan

Inheriting Speech: Talking Books Come to Flavian Rome........ 373
Ana Maria Lóio

Bibliography 393
General Index........ 425
Index Locorum 435

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This volume originates from an international conference held in Delphi, Greece, the *omphalos* of the earth, in the summer of 2012 (July 2–4). The European Cultural Center at Delphi provided to all participants an excellent venue to reflect on Flavian literature and its relationship to the Greek literary past, as well as enjoy the extraordinary views from Mt. Parnassus to the bay of Itea, the archaeological site and museum, and of course enjoy Greek hospitality.

The conference included presentations on other authors of the Flavian and the early Trajanic periods, such as Josephus and Dio Chrysostom, but unfortunately the present volume is confined to the poetry of the Flavian period. Therefore, I would like to thank all participants, as I hope that there will be an opportunity for collaboration in the future also. I would like to extend my warmest thanks to all the contributors to this volume for the enthusiasm with which they embraced this project and their co-operation that saw to its swift completion only a few months after the conference. I would also like to thank the former Senior Acquisitions Editor for Classical Studies, Irene van Rossum, and the former Editor for Classics at Brill, Caroline van Erp, for their continuing support and enthusiasm. My gratitude is also owed to the current team at Brill, Tessel Jonquière and Jennifer Pavelko.

My father, Charidemos Augoustakis, traveled from Crete to accompany me to Delphi for the conference: with his excellent sense of humor and his good patience, he helped me tremendously *in situ* with last minute details that such a big enterprise entailed. To him this volume is dedicated with love.

Antony Augoustakis
Urbana, Illinois
October 2013

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Antony Augoustakis is Associate Professor of Classics at the University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA) and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Centennial Scholar. He is the author of *Motherhood and the Other: Fashioning Female Power in Flavian Epic* (Oxford, 2010) and *Plautus' Mercator* (Bryn Mawr, 2009). He has edited the *Brill Companion to Silius Italicus* (Leiden, 2010), *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic* (Oxford, 2013), and co-edited with Carole Newlands *Statius' Siluae and the Poetics of Intimacy* (*Arethusa*, 2007) and with Ariana Traill the *Blackwell Companion to Terence* (Malden, Mass., 2013). He is working on a commentary on Statius' *Thebaid* 8 (Oxford) and the *Oxford Readings in Flavian Epic*, co-edited with Helen Lovatt (Oxford).

Federica Bessone is Associate Professor of Latin language and literature at the University of Turin (Italy). She studied at the Scuola Normale Superiore and the University of Pisa and has held research fellowships in Munich, Oxford, and Berkeley. She is author of *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistula XII: Medea Iasoni* (Florence, 1997) and *La Tebaide di Stazio: Epica e potere* (Pisa, 2011). She has co-edited the volume *Politica e cultura in Roma antica: Atti dell'incontro di studio in ricordo di Italo Lana* (*Torino, 16–17 ottobre 2003*) (Bologna, 2005) and *Tanti affetti in tal momento: Studi in onore di Giovanna Garbarino* (Alessandria, 2011). She has also published articles on Ovid, Statius, Valerius Flaccus, Petronius, and Seneca. She is a member of the scientific committee of *EuGeStA*, the electronic journal of the European network on Gender Studies in Antiquity. She co-organized with Marco Fucecchi the conference *I generi letterari nell'età dei Flavi: Canoni, trasformazioni, ricezione* (Turin, 2013).

Cristiano Castelletti is SNSF researcher at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland). He is the author of *Porfirio: Sullo Stige* (Milan, 2006). He has published on Virgil, Aratus, and Valerius, while his commentary on Valerius' *Argonautica* 8 is forthcoming. He is currently working on a book project on Aratus' *Phaenomena* and its tradition in Flavian poetry, provisionally entitled *Flavian Sky: Aratean Tradition and Imperial Ideology in Flavian Epic*.

Robert Cowan is Lecturer in Classics at the University of Sydney (Australia), having previously held posts at the Universities of Exeter and Bristol, as well as Brasenose and Balliol Colleges in Oxford. His research interests range over much of Greek and especially Latin poetry, and he has published on Aristophanes, Lucretius, Cicero, Cinna, Ticida, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Columella, Suetonius and Juvenal, as well as ancient graffiti and the operatic reception of Greek tragedy. However, his main specialty is Flavian epic, especially Silius Italicus, and Republican tragedy. He is working on the following projects: *Virgil's Aeneid* (London), *After Virgil* (Liverpool), and a monograph on Silius (Oxford).

Simone Finkmann is Lecturer in Classics at the University of Oxford (Somerville College, UK). She previously taught Greek and Latin literature at Christ Church and St. Hilda's College (Oxford, UK) and worked as language instructor for the Classics Faculty. Her main research interests lie in narratology and discourse analysis, ancient and medieval epic poetry, as well as Latin poetry of the late Republic and early empire.

Marco Fucecchi is Assistant Professor of Latin language and literature at the University of Udine (Italy). He specializes in Latin poetry from the Augustan age (Virgil and Ovid in particular) to the early empire (Lucan, Calpurnius), with a focus on Flavian epic. He has published a commentary in two volumes (1997 and 2006) on Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* 6, as well as several articles, mostly on Valerius and Silius Italicus. He is currently working on a commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid* 3 and various articles.

Daniela Galli is currently a Visiting Scholar at New York University (New York City, New York, USA). She holds a Ph.D. in Latin Philology from the University of Pisa (Italy). She is the author of a commentary on Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* 1 (Berlin, 2007) and of articles on Flavian Epic, as well as Curtius Rufus. She is currently working on a commentary on Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum*.

Jean-Michel Hulls is Head of Classics at Dulwich College (London, UK). Following the completion of a Ph.D. on Statius *Thebaid* in 2006 at UCL, he continues to write on Flavian literature, especially the epic poetry of the period. He has published a number of articles and chapters on Statius' *Thebaid* and *Siluae*, Silius Italicus, Martial, and Suetonius. He is particularly interested in the theme of identity and in the reception of Flavian literature

and intends to continue writing on these whenever the busy life of the teacher permits.

Evangelos Karakasis is Assistant Professor of Latin at the University of Ioannina (Greece). He is the author of *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy* (Cambridge, 2005) and *Song Exchange in Roman Pastoral* (Berlin, 2011). He has also written several articles on Roman comedy, elegy, and the pastoral.

Darcy Krasne is Visiting Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of Missouri (Columbia, Missouri, USA). She completed her degrees at Corpus Christi College (Oxford) and the University of California at Berkeley, with a dissertation on duality and mythic variation in Ovid and Valerius Flaccus. Her research interests primarily revolve around the poetry of Ovid and Valerius Flaccus, with a particular view to mythology, onomastics, and puns. She has published articles on Ovid's *Ibis* and is currently working on a monograph on Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*. In addition, she has translations of three poems by Ovid and Catullus forthcoming in *Classical and Modern Literature*.

R. Joy Littlewood is an independent scholar based in Oxford (UK). Her early articles focused on humor in Roman elegy and literary aspects of Ovid's *Fasti*. An interest in archaic Rome and Roman religion led to a commentary on Ovid's *Fasti* 6 (Oxford, 2006). Since then she has worked exclusively on Flavian epic, completing a commentary on Silius Italicus' *Punica* 7 (Oxford, 2011). Her current project is a commentary on *Punica* 10, which includes analysis of structure, sublimity, the poetics of defeat, and generic instability surrounding the pivotal moment which initiates Carthaginian decline and Roman recovery.

Ana Maria Lóio is Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of Lisbon (Portugal). Her dissertation was entitled *Ego Liber: Talking Books in Latin Epigram*. Her research interests include Statius' *Siluae* and Martial's poetry. She has published an article on "Commemorating Events: The *Victoria Sosibii* in Statius' *Siluae* 4.3" (*Classical Quarterly*, 2012) and is currently working on the publication of her dissertation as a monograph.

Irene Mitousi completed her Ph.D. at the University of Thessaloniki (Greece) in 2007 with the thesis *De genere: Gender and Genre in Ovid's Heroides*. In 2009–2010, she taught Latin language and historiography at the

University of Patras. She has worked for E. Kriaras' *Lexicon of Medieval Greek Demotic Literature 1100–1669* and the forthcoming *Latin-Modern Greek Lexicon* (D. Niketas and L. Tromaras, eds.), as well as for the Archive of Musical Iconography and Literary Sources in Thessaloniki (2003–2007). Her article "*Galle, quid insanis*? Or the Menace of Love in Virgil's *oeuvre*" is forthcoming in *Hellenica*.

Margot Neger is a postdoctoral student at the Classics Department of the University of Salzburg (Austria). She studied Classics at the Karl-Franzens University of Graz and the Ludwig-Maximilians University in Munich. Her doctoral thesis was published in 2012: *Martials Dichtergedichte: Das Epigramm als Medium der poetischen Selbstreflexion* (Tübingen). Her research interests focus on Latin poetry and prose of the imperial period, as well as Greek and Latin epistolography. Her current book-project is a study of the intertextuality in the *Letters* of Pliny the Younger.

Arianna Sacerdoti is Assistant Professor in Latin language and literature at the Seconda Università degli Studi di Napoli (Italy). In 2007 she completed her Ph.D., part of which was carried out at the Department of Classics of the University of Toronto and at the University of Naples Federico II, with a dissertation on *Thebaid* 12. She has published in national and international journals articles on Statius, Aulus Gellius, the Flavians, and the Italian reception of Latin literature in the nineteenth century. She is the author of the monograph *Nouus unde furor: Una lettura del dodicesimo libro della Tebaide di Stazio* (Pisa, 2012).

Carey Seal is Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of California (Davis, California, USA). He received his Ph.D. from Princeton University. His research interests are in Roman philosophical writing and Roman epic. His book in progress is entitled *Philosophy and Community in Seneca's Prose*.

Pavlos Sfyroeras is Associate Professor of Classics at Middlebury College (Middlebury, VT, USA). In addition to several articles that he has published on a number of archaic and classical Greek poets, his book *The Feast of Poetry: Sacrifice and Performance in Aristophanic Comedy* is forthcoming from Harvard University Press. He is currently working on two book-length projects, tentatively entitled *Aristophanes Sophos: Comedy and Philosophy in the Late 5th Century* and *Pindar's Epichoric Mythmaking*.

Jörn Soerink is a Ph.D. student of Classics at the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (Netherlands). He studied Classics and Literary Studies at the University of Amsterdam and the University of Oxford. He is currently writing his dissertation, a commentary on Statius' *Thebaid* 5.499–753. He also teaches Latin language and literature at the University of Leiden.

Michiel van der Keur is a Ph.D. student of Classics at the VU University in Amsterdam (Netherlands). He is currently finishing his dissertation, a commentary on Silius Italicus' *Punica* 13; he has published a number of reviews and an article on Silius. His main research focuses are Silius' multilayered intertextuality and the fruitful combination with discourse linguistics in studying the *Punica*.

Marco van der Schuur is a Ph.D. student of Classics at the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (Netherlands). He is currently writing his dissertation on the interaction between Senecan tragedy and Latin epic, examining Seneca's response to the major themes of Augustan epic, as well as the reception of Senecan tragedy in Statius' *Thebaid*.

TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS USED

The consonantal 'v' and 'j' in the Latin texts has been printed as 'u' and 'i' and 'V' and 'I' in capitals. The following standard editions have been used for quotations from the original Greek and Latin texts (*BT* = Bibliotheca Teubneriana; *OCT* = Oxford Classical Texts). Translations of major authors used throughout this book have been adapted from the sources listed below. For the rest of (minor) quotations, the authors have used their own translations.

Anthologia Palatina (*AP*)	Paton, W.R. *Loeb* 1916–1918
Apollonius Rhodius	Race, W.H. *Loeb* 2008
Aratus	Kidd, D. *Cambridge* 1997
Asclepiades	Sens, A. *Oxford* 2011
Callimachus	Pfeiffer, R. *Oxford* 1949–1953; trans. Nisetich, F. *Oxford* 2001
Callimachus' *Aetia*	Harder, A. *Oxford* 2012
Catullus	Lee, G. *Oxford* 1990
Cicero's *Pro Archia*	Watts, N.H. *Loeb* 1923
Cicero's *Republic*	Powell, J.G.F. *OCT* 2006; trans. Keyes, C.W. *Loeb* 1928
Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*	King, J.E. *Loeb* 1950
Ciris	Goodyear, F.R.D. *OCT* 1966
Cyclic *Thebaid*	West, M.L. *Loeb* 2003
Dio Chrysostom	De Arnim, J. *Berlin* 1893–1896; trans. Cohoon, J.W. and Lamar Crosby, H. *Loeb* 1932
Diodorus Siculus	Oldfather, C.H. *Loeb* 1935
Dionysius Scytobrachion	Constantacopoulou, C. *Brill* 2010
Ennius' *Annals*	Skutsch, O. *Oxford* 1985
Ennius' *Epigrams* and *Varia*	Vahlen, I. *BT* 1854
Euripides	Kovacs, D. *Loeb* 1994–2002
Euripides' *Hypsipyle*	Collard, C. and Cropp, M.J. *Loeb* 2008
Germanicus's *Aratea*	Gain, D.B. *London* 1976
Homer's *Iliad*	Murray, A.T. and Wyatt, W.F. *Loeb* 1999
Homer's *Odyssey*	Murray, A.T. and Dimock, G.E. *Loeb* 1995
Horace's *Odes* and *Epodes*	Rudd, N. *Loeb* 2004
Horace's *Satires*, *Epistles*, and *Ars Poetica*	Fairclough, H.R. *Loeb* 1929
Livy's *Ab Vrbe Condita* 21–22	Foster, B.O. *Loeb* 1929
Lucan	Shackleton Bailey, D.R. *BT* 1997^2; trans. Braund, S.H. *Oxford* 1992
Lucretius	Martin, J. *BT* 1969; trans. Rouse, W.H.D. and Smith, M.F. *Loeb* 1992

Martial	Shackleton Bailey, D.R. *BT* 1990; trans. *Loeb* 1993
Mythographi Vaticani	Kulcsár, P. *Turnhout* 1987; trans. Pepin, R.E. *New York* 2008
Ovid's *Heroides* and *Amores*	Showerman, G. and Goold, G.P. *Loeb* 1977
Ovid's *Metamorphoses*	Miller, F.J. and Goold, G.P. *Loeb* 1977
Ovid's *Tristia*	Wheeler, A.L. and Goold, G.P. *Loeb* 1988
Philitas	Spanoudakis, K. *Brill* 2002
Pindar	Race, W.H. *Loeb* 1997
Plutarch's *Moralia*	Babbitt, F.C. *Loeb* 1936
Propertius	Goold, G.P. *Loeb* 1990
Seneca the Elder	Winterbottom, M. *Loeb* 1974
Seneca's *Dialogi*	Reynolds, L.D. *OCT* 1977
Seneca's *Tragedies*	Fitch, J.G. *Loeb* 2004
Silius Italicus	Delz, J. *BT* 1987; trans. Duff, J.D. *Loeb* 1934
Sophocles	Lloyd-Jones, H. *Loeb* 1994–1996
Statius' *Siluae*	Courtney, E. *OCT* 1992; trans. Shackleton Bailey, D.R. *Loeb* 2003
Statius' *Thebaid*	Hill, D.E., *Brill* 1996^2; trans. Shackleton Bailey, D.R. *Loeb* 2003
Statius' *Achilleid*	Shackleton Bailey, D.R. *Loeb* 2003
Suda	Adler, A. *Lexicographi Graeci* 1928–1938
Suetonius' *De Grammaticis*	Kaster, R.A. *Oxford* 1995
Tibullus	Dennis, R.G. and Putnam, M.C.J. *Berkeley* 2012
Valerius Flaccus	Ehlers, W.W. *BT* 1980; trans. Mozley, J.H. *Loeb* 1934
Virgil	Mynors, R.A.B. *OCT* 1969; trans. Fairclough, H.R. and Goold, G.P. *Loeb* 1999–2000
Xenophanes	Edmonds, J.M. *Loeb* 1931; trans. Lesher, J.H. *Toronto* 1992

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Greek authors and works are abbreviated according to the system of the *LSJ*, while Latin authors and works follow the system of the *OLD*. Any gaps are supplemented from the abbreviations of the *OCD*^{4} (or adopted from the *OCD*^{4} to avoid confusion among different authors). Periodicals have been abbreviated based on *L'Année Philologique*.

Hornblower, S., Spawforth, A., and Eidinow, E. eds. (2012^{4}). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford.
Glare, P.G.W. ed. (2012^{2}). *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford.
Liddell, H.G., Scott, R., and Jones, H.S. eds. (1940^{9}). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford.

Modern Works

ANRW	Vogt, J., Temporini, H., and Haase, W. eds. (1972–). *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Berlin.
Courtney	Courtney, E. (1993). *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
LIMC	*Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*. (1981–). Zurich.
Roscher	Roscher, W.H. ed. (1884–1937). *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. Leipsig.
TLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. (1900–). Leipzig.

INTRODUCTION

BETWEEN GREECE AND ITALY: FLAVIAN POETRY AND ITS TRADITIONS

Antony Augoustakis

> imp. [C]aesar di[vi] Vespasiani f. [D]omitianus Aug. [Germ]anic[u]s p[ont. max]im. tr[ib. po]test. III … tem[plu]m Apo[llinis] sua im[p]ensa refecit
> (*ILS* 8905; McCrum and Woodhead [1961] 463a)
>
> Emperor Caesar Domitian Augustus Germanicus, son of divine Vespasian, Pontifex Maximus, in the third year of his power as tribune … restored the temple of Apollo with his own money.
>
> … [ἔδοξε τᾶι πό]λει τῶν Δελφῶν τὰς περὶ τοῦ ἀγῶνος τοῦ Πυθι[κοῦ πεμφθείσα]ς αὐτοῖς ἐπιστ[ο]λὰς ἐν τὸν ἐπισαμότατο[ν τόπον τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐν λιθίναν] στάλαν ἐνχαράξαι (McCrum and Woodhead [1961] 463b)
>
> The city of Delphi decided to inscribe on a stone *stele*, in the most prestigious place of the temple, the letters sent to them concerning the Pythian games.

In 84 CE, Domitian restored the temple of Apollo, as the above Latin inscription attests, and in 90 CE, the Delphians decree that the correspondence exchanged with regard to the Pythian games, as we can glean from the Greek inscription above, be inscribed on a *stele* and set up at the temple. This is one of many disputes that arose during Domitian's emperorship, which the Flavian ruler intervened to resolve: as Brian Jones suggests, the epistles themselves "attest to the high regard in which Domitian was held in the East, the result, no doubt, of his genuine philhellenism."[1] This is just a small proof of the relations between Greek cities and the Roman center during the Flavian period, confirmed by even a cursory look at our sources and material culture.

This volume originates from an international conference held in Delphi, Greece, the *omphalos* of the earth, in the summer of 2012. Delphi was

[1] Jones (1992) 112.

chosen as the place of poetic and literary inspiration celebrated throughout Flavian literature, and in particular, but not limited to, Flavian epic. In Statius' *Thebaid* 1, for instance, the Delphic Apollo features as the angry god who sends punishment to Argos for the killing of Linus and Psamathe, in the form of the monster *Poine*, the personified Punishment; in the ninth book, we hear about the death of a "prophet whose demise brings silence to Delphi" (*rapto tacuerunt augure Delphi*, *Theb*. 9.513). The numerous participants in the conference addressed in their papers the intimate relationship of the Flavian Greek and Roman authors with their Greek literary predecessors, but also the meaning of this interaction within the socio-cultural context of the Flavian age more broadly. Undoubtedly, the Flavian authors engage in a fruitful dialogue with the literature produced in Greece from the Homeric epics through the archaic period to the classical age and the Hellenistic period. For example, the *Achilleid* sings of Achilles' transvestism on the Greek island of Scyros before his trip to Troy, and already in the prologue of the epyllion the author betrays an anxiety to go beyond Homer. Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* memorializes in verse the Argonautic expedition from Greece to the unknown, barbaric, and uncivilized countries of the Black Sea. The *Thebaid* itself takes place in, and its name from, the Greek city of Thebes, as it recounts the political alliances and enmities among the famous Hellenic cities of the distant mythological past, Argos and Athens.

And yet this extensive engagement with Greece is not just thematic or geographical: the Greek literary past is conceived as the poetic influence of Homer, the Cyclic tradition, Greek lyric poetry, Greek tragedy, Hellenistic poetry and aesthetics, and Greek historiography on Latin prose and poetry. Authors accessible to us, and numerous others no longer extant, fascinate the Flavian authors, not only those who live and write in the city of Rome but also those who are between cultures, such as Statius and Silius in bilingual Naples. The Flavian epicists reach out to Virgil, Ovid, and Lucan, but they only do so through Homer and Apollonius. Martial's epigrammatic poetry makes extensive use of the Hellenistic epigram, through Catullus and the Latin tradition.

Flavian Poetry and its Greek Past breaks new ground by examining the intimate literary affiliation between the Flavian poets and their Greek literary predecessors, but also the meaning of this interaction within the socio-cultural context of the Flavian age more broadly. Early and mid-twentieth century studies on Flavian literature often focused on the narrow verbal correspondences and thematic allusions between the authors of the period and the major predecessors of representative genres in Greek literature, such

as Homer[2] and Apollonius Rhodius,[3] Euripides,[4] or the various Hellenistic epigrammatists,[5] for instance. The breadth of the topic, however, opens a rich ground for further exploration, which the present volume aspires to cover.[6]

The volume has been divided into five parts. The first part offers a discussion of the role of sleeplessness in Flavian literature in general, and especially the Flavian epicists. The second part is dedicated to Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*, its Greek sources, namely Apollonius primarily, but also other important intertexts, heretofore left in the margin of Valerian criticism. The third part consists of contributions to Statius' epic poems (the *Thebaid* and *Achilleid*) and the poet's engagement with Greek literature, from Homer to the Greek tragedians. The fourth section covers Silius Italicus' *Punica* and the poet's relationship with the Greek literary past. Finally, the fifth part of the volume examines the Greek roots of Martial's epigrammatic poetry.

Scenes of sleep and insomnia are frequently employed in Greco-Roman epic as crucial turning-points in the narrative, as we can see, for instance, in *Iliad* 14, in *Aeneid* 4, in *Metamorphoses* 11, or in *Thebaid* 10. Arianna Sacerdoti investigates the role of such scenes in Flavian epic in particular. Her typology of insomniac subjects includes leaders in command of an army (a sort of "masculine" insomnia), such as Scipio, Hannibal, Adrastus, or helmsmen, such as Tiphys, but also revelers in a festivity, such as the Thebans in *Thebaid* 2. Sleeplessness is undoubtedly associated with poetic activity, and as such it is emphasized by Statius in his occasional poetry, the *Siluae*. Like the heroes of Greek and Latin epic poetry, Statius and his circle of friends in the lyric poems are associated with insomnia, which in this case has positive results, unlike the sleeplessness of wearied soldiers and leaders.

From this general overview of all three Flavian epic poets, the volume moves to sections dedicated to the individual poets. The most obvious author of the Flavian period working extensively with a Greek model is Valerius Flaccus. The Flavian *Argonautica* approaches Greek myth from

---

2 Juhnke (1972) offers a good and still indispensable treatment of allusions to Homer in Flavian epic.

3 Bahrenfuss (1951) examines the Lemnian episode in Apollonius and Valerius. Studies on Valerius Flaccus, both past and more recent, expand on early twentieth century dissertations on allusions to Apollonius and investigate further, and sometimes quite exhaustively, the relationship between the two authors.

4 Reussner (1921).

5 Autore (1937).

6 The scope of this volume is much wider than the essays comprised in Bonadeo, Canobbio, and Gasti (2011) on philhellenism and identity in the Flavian age.

various new angles, and the essays in this section of the book treat many of these aspects of the multi-faceted poem. Darcy Krasne opens this part of the volume by examining the construction of the ship of the Argonauts, the Argo, as well as its (partial) destruction at the Clashing Rocks and the question of its eventual catasterism. Krasne's aim is to investigate the destructive aspect of Valerius' engagement with his Greek predecessors, Apollonius and Aratus. Whereas Aratus points to the rear half of the Argo as the homonymous constellation, Valerius portrays this rear half as the part of the ship destroyed by the Symplegades. Valerius' Argo loses its half, and the rest is destined for the stars. By rejecting Aratus, and to a certain degree Apollonius, Valerius creates a version of the Argonautic ship that is severely damaged by the Rocks, and by extension the civil war as it unfolds in Colchis. As Krasne points out, Valerius fails to protect his ship from herself and from her predecessors.

Cristiano Castelletti continues the discussion of the influence of Aratus on Valerius by studying the erudite presence of acrostics in the Roman *Argonautica*. Various acrostics are employed by Valerius in the Aratean manner, and each one of them has a specific role in the context in which it occurs. Castelletti astutely shows how Greek words, such as *aidos* ("shame") and *necroi* ("dead") are incorporated in the narrative to evoke a Homeric or a Virgilian intertext, and how the presence of acrostics helps orient the reader towards a better understanding of the text and its context. Discussing several new (and some very elaborate) findings, not only in Valerius, but also in Aratus and Virgil, Castelletti shows that the Flavian poet is a continuator of a tradition set by his predecessors.

Simone Finkmann compares the Valerian and Apollonian accounts with a specific focus on the use of direct speech. Finkmann studies the occurrence of collective speech (of the protagonist, called "primary," and of other groups, called "secondary") and collective silence in Valerius to draw parallelisms with its Hellenistic predecessor but also to discuss the meaning of any differences between the two. In particular, Finkmann's examination points to many similarities to, but also various digressions from, the Hellenistic model. Valerius' speeches are assigned to speakers different from Apollonius, depending on the context and narrative scope. Lack of speech, or collective silence, underscores moments of grief, shock, or fear. Clearly then speech and silence are utilized by Valerius for the characterization of the Argonauts and their opponents.

In the following essay, Marco van der Schuur discusses the deaths of Idmon and Tiphys in Valerius to show how the Flavian poet rewrites Apollonius through Virgil and Homer. The Virgilian deaths and funerals of Palin-

urus and Misenus (and of Elpenor in the *Odyssey*) are combined by Valerius with the depiction of the deaths of Idmon and Tiphys in Apollonius. As a result, Valerius emerges both as a confident restructurer of, and a sophisticated commentator on, the epic tradition he inherits. The culminating point of Valerius' account is when he conflates the two deaths and funerals into one without distinction. This combination is the result of a tension in the epic tradition, namely of a death preceding a *katabasis* and of the sacrifice of one for many. Van der Schuur clearly demonstrates how the Flavian poet masterfully reconstructs Apollonius while he deconstructs Virgil.

Carey Seal examines the episode of the civil war, which occupies over a book in Valerius' poem. Clearly an innovation on Valerius' part, the topic of civil war becomes an important one in the framework of the poem, because Valerius employs it as a medium to reconcile the version of the story of the Argo being the first-ship and Apollonian views of the Argo's place in human history. The Flavian Argonauts are closely alligned with their Apollonian counterparts, as Valerius harmonizes the two ways of locating the Argo in history. According to Seal, Valerius follows the tradition that connects navigation with the advent of violence between kin and friends, while he also situates the presence of murderous actions in the world before the launch of the Argo. Close examination of the episodes in Iolcus, on Lemnos, in the land of the Doliones, and finally during the civil war in Colchis points to Valerius' synthesis of the Apollonian and other accounts (Ovid, Hesiod, and Seneca) to create a Flavian, Roman *Argonautica*.

Daniela Galli undertakes the difficult topic of other Argonautic sources which Valerius may have used, the most prominent of which is Dionysius Scytobrachion's *Argonautica*, as partially preserved through the account of Diodorus Siculus. As Galli claims, Dionysius' influence on Valerius is discernible from a number of passages in the Flavian *Argonautica*, especially in the first book, where Valerius deviates from Apollonius' account. Galli examines several instances where Valerius may have made use of Dionysius' account, such as in the episode of Hercules saving Hesione from the sea-monster or in the prominent episode of the suicide of Jason's parents, both of which find parallels in Dionysius' version. Unfortunately, we know too little about Dionysius Scytobrachion's account to be able to delineate the exact relationship with Valerius' text. It is nevertheless a remarkable source that needs to be further explored in future studies of the Flavian poet.

In the final essay in this section of the volume, Irene Mitousi examines Valerius' poem as an ideological epic of the Flavian period. Informed by Susan Suleiman's definition of "ideological" narrative, Mitousi investigates how Valerius dictates to the reader not only the story of the Argonauts but

also its interpretation as well. By association of the Argonautic saga and the Flavian emperors with the Augustan age through the intertext of Virgil's *Georgics*, Valerius employs redundancy as a means for disambiguation. The socio-political message of the poem is well defined through the repetition of themes, such as the overthrow of tyranny, the conquest of monsters, and the liberation of oppressed people. Direct links to Vespasian and the new age announced by the Flavian *gens* allow the poet to establish a clear association between the Greek Argonautic myth and the Roman imperialist realities of his time.

Jörn Soerink begins the section dedicated to the poet Statius, the bilingual poet of Naples, by exploring the Greek tragic sources of Statius, with a special focus on the narrative of Hypsipyle and the Nemean digression of *Thebaid* 4–6. Going beyond the simple matching of verbal allusions and motifs, common in *Quellenforschung*, Soerink investigates not *whether* Statius has made use of Euripides' *Hypsipyle* but *how* he employs the Greek model. Crucial questions are answered: why does Statius privilege the role of Bacchus in his narrative; what is the meaning of Hypsipyle's reunion with her children; why does Hypsipyle become an epic narrator in the poem? Statius borrows themes from the Euripidean tragedy only to transform and fit them within the framework of the *Thebaid*. Such metamorphosis does not preclude Statius' rejection of the Euripidean model in favor of the epic tradition.

Jean-Michel Hulls continues the discussion of the influence of Greek tragedy on Statius. As Hulls observes, Statius makes intertextual links with his Greek poetic inheritance in a manner which we might describe as "Romanizing": Statius inherits the Greek poetic past through the Latin tradition but makes a conscious effort to acknowledge his Greek predecessors while he reverses their treatment of the myth. Hulls discusses the affinities between Statius and Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* in the portraits of Oedipus and Creon, as well as the influence of the Euripidean Evadne on the portrayal of Statius' Menoeceus. In addition, Statius' transformation of Theseus at the end of the *Thebaid* is another example of the poet's appropriation and redirection of the Greek tragic canon to fit the historical context of the empire. Athens becomes a quasi-Roman city with an autocratic, quasi-Roman ruler, as Statius changes his literary inheritance and Romanizes Greek tragedy.

Federica Bessone turns her attention to the two prologues, in the *Thebaid* and especially the *Achilleid*, and discusses them in conjunction with the programmatic passages in Statius' *Siluae* to show how Statius presents himself as a poet with regard to his Greek models. Mythic, literary, and sociological models of the poet as a *uates* or a performer, singing with a real

or symbolic lyre in front of an audience, on a given occasion, are crucial to Statius' construction of his poetic *persona*. Statius fashions himself as a citizen of both worlds, Greek and Roman, enjoying a type of "honorary citizenship" as continuator of Homer and the epic tradition. Such a topos, however, is not strictly epic: it alludes to Cicero's Archias, for instance. At the same time, Statius is registered as a *uates*, like Amphion of Thebes or Orpheus, as a Greek *aoidos*, in the footsteps of his father Statius the *grammaticus*. As Bessone argues, these characteristics of Statian poetics give his poetry an ecumenical dimension, encompassing the grand and the casual of epic and occasional poetry respectively.

In the final paper on Statius, Pavlos Sfyroeras discusses the role of a Homeric simile in the *Achilleid*, Achilles' blush. Sfyroeras effectively shows how Statius returns to the Homeric prototype but also innovates by breaking up the Homeric simile into its constitutive parts which he then scatters across his *Achilleid*. According to Sfyroeras, the Iliadic simile showcases the feminine and masculine elements which will play a very important role in the extant fragment of the poem, a poem after all dedicated to Achilles' cross-dressing on Scyros.

Silius Italicus' *Punica* is the poem that occupies the next section of the volume. Evangelos Karakasis opens the discussion by offering an overview of the Homeric characterization of the two opponents in the seventh book of Silius' *Punica*, Fabius and Hannibal. By means of an elaborate nexus of intertextual references to the Homeric epics, and especially the night raid episode in *Iliad* 10, through Statius, Lucan, and Virgil, Silius constructs his narrative in such a way as to present Hannibal and Fabius as intricate composites of various Homeric and post-Homeric heroes, from Achilles and Nestor to Turnus, Aeneas, and Caesar. At the same time, the Flavian poet establishes clear connections between his heroes and Vespasianic / Domitianic Rome, by presenting Hannibal and his "positive double" Fabius as archetypes of the Flavian principate.

The Carthaginian general's complex characterization features prominently in the following essay by R. Joy Littlewood, who investigates the theme of conviviality in the Greco-Roman epic tradition in order to demonstrate how Silius elaborately presents the perversion of commensality in the city of Capua, where Hannibal spends the winter with his army. Convivial abuse is a topos in Flavian literature, and Littlewood shows how the epic banquet offers Silius a multifaceted opportunity to expose Hannibal's moral flaws; in the manner of Pindar, Silius depicts the Carthaginian as the enemy of Rome, just as the Greek lyric poet presents the "enemies of Zeus" as hostile to the delights of feasts and the lyre. The Titan-like Hannibal does not heed

the implicit warnings during the Capuan banquet and therefore confirms Pindar's belief that Apollo's lyre and the blessings of harmonious conviviality lie beyond the comprehension of Titans and tyrants.

Michiel van der Keur's essay looks at the influence of Homer on Silius more closely, by discussing the episode of Scipio's *katabasis* to the Underworld and his meeting with the ghost of Homer there. The entire passage arguably invites comparison between Greeks and Romans, be they heroes or poets. As Van der Keur suggests, the passage sheds light on Silius' own poetics and self-representation, the relation between Greek epic and the *Punica*, and the power of poetry in general. The emerging picture that Silius promotes for himself is one that presents the Flavian poet as the Roman Homer, who picks up and continues Homeric epic with Roman themes. Silius privileges the theme of the transcendence of mortality both for epic heroes and their poets, Homer and Silius himself.

Finally, Marco Fucecchi studies how Silius engages with Greek theories about the birth and growth of Rome, its rapid military expansion, and its socio-political transformation. The Flavian poet enriches the portrait of the young leader by drawing on Ciceronian characters but also by using the model of Alexander the Great, an exemplary figure of the Greek literary tradition on kingship, especially of the "good king." According to Fucecchi, Silius reverses the negative model of an autocrat Alexander, popular under the Neronian age, and employs the Macedonian king as a positive figure in constructing a Roman ideal of kingship. In fact, by defeating Hannibal, the most dangerous contender for the title of the greatest world-leader after Alexander's death, Scipio overcomes all negative aspects of the Greek monarch and is presented as the new, Flavian ruler to the audience of Silius' poem.

The following and final section of the volume moves from epic poetry to the epigram and examines closely Martial's epigrammatic poetry and its engagement with its Greek predecessors. Margot Neger's essay treats this very topic, by looking at why Martial rarely mentions explicitly any of his Greek predecessors in the genre of epigram: the Flavian poet chooses to allude to them throughout the corpus instead. As Neger shows, Martial makes use of Greek epigram in programmatic passages and exploits the Greek tradition for his own literary self-definition. Poets like Antipater, Callimachus, Lucillius, and Xenophanes, are often evoked as intertexts to be changed immediately by Martial into a new composition, suitable for the contemporary, Roman times. In this manner, Martial manages to incorporate and transform creatively his predecessors, while establishing himself within the history of the genre as a worthy successor.

Robert Cowan turns his attention to "window allusions" in Martial, references to earlier (Greek) predecessors by means of an intermediate (Latin) source. More specifically, Cowan studies poem 1.92 to propose a window allusion to Callimachus through Catullus. Martial alludes to, and imitates features of, Catullus' Furius and Aurelius cycle with an allusion to the *Aetia* prologue of Callimachus, and as Cowan demonstrates, Martial annotates or constructs a metapoetic dimension to that cycle which engages with Catullus' own complex engagement with Callimachus and Callimacheanism.

In the final essay on Martial, Ana Maria Lóio examines those epigrams of Martial which are allegedly spoken by the book itself, especially in the tenth book of Martial, in the *Xenia*, and the *Apophoreta*. As Lóio demonstrates, Martial continues the Greek, especially Hellenistic, tradition of "speaking books," because he is particularly interested in the polemical attitude that permeates such poems. Furthermore, Martial's exploration of the talking book epigram works well with his objective to deconstruct the hierarchy between the *genus tenue* (epigrammatic poetry) and the *genus grande* (martial epic).

The essays in this volume aim to provide an overview and a detailed analysis of specific episodes. But of course such an enterprise could by no means be exhaustive. Nevertheless, we hope that this book opens avenues of further investigation and future studies on the fascinating world of Flavian literature.

PART I

FLAVIAN LITERATURE AND GREEK INTERTEXTS

QUIS MAGNA TUENTI / SOMNUS? SCENES OF SLEEPLESSNESS (AND INTERTEXTUALITY) IN FLAVIAN POETRY

Arianna Sacerdoti

1. *Sleep, Insomnia, and Poetics*

In recent studies on Flavian literature,[1] the theme of sleep and sleeplessness, has heretofore been approached mostly thematically[2] and focused on single authors.[3] I consider this area of study still to be a harbinger of analysis that defines, both intra- and intertextually, the aesthetics and poetics of Statius, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus in relation to their epic models. There are many differences among the individual authors, as there are also similarities.

It is well known that sleep (richly and variously characterized and at times personified) and sleeplessness feature prominently in Greek and Latin epic poetry.[4] The intertextual fabric of the poetics of sleep and dreams[5] in Statius, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus[6] is greatly indebted, as is true with other themes as well,[7] to the presence of ὕπνος in Homer and in Apollonius Rhodius. Though belonging to a different literary genre, Statius' *Siluae* comprise, just as the epic poems do, a rich array of passages dedicated to sleep and wakefulness, in a unique recurrence of themes that not only

---

1 See Manuwald (2007) 71 and Zissos (2002) 69–71.

2 Carrai (1990) studies the invocation of sleep in Italian literature; on Statius, see 18–26.

3 See, e.g., the most recent work by Scioli (2005).

4 Extensively discussed in Scioli (2005) 186–204.

5 On dreams in classical antiquity, see especially Bouquet (2001); but also Dodds (1951) 102–134; Steiner (1952); Kessels (1978); Scioli (2005) 35–110; Harris (2009).

6 For the lack of comprehensive studies attempting a synthesis analysing the three authors, see Ripoll (1998) 2.

7 On various aspects of the Greek influence on the Flavian epicists see, e.g., Juhnke (1972); Burck (1981); Hardie (1983) 75–102; Smolenaars (1991); Ripoll (2001); Zissos (2002) 72–92; Galli (2007a) 9–18; Manuwald (2007); Gibson (2010) 53 and n. 22; Bonadeo, Canobbio, and Gasti (2011); Littlewood (2011) xxxviii–xxxix; and the essays in this volume.

reminds us of the *Thebaid* and the *Achilleid* and their earlier models, but also develops along noticeably original lines.[8]

In these texts, we encounter various categories of beings subject to sleeplessness (divine, human, and animal). The causes of insomnia are habitually explicit in both the Greek and Latin poets, apart from rare cases such as Statius' fascinating poem, *Siluae* 5.4. There are those insomnias imposed and suffered by a subject and other insomnias sought after and desired by the same subject.

2. *Leaders in Command* (*Poetics and Intertextuality*)

The first category of insomniac subjects examined is related to the leaders in command (the single-character type). Contrasted to the abandonment, typical of sleep, this type is characterized by the control of reality, typical of sleeplessness. In other words, this is a "masculine" insomnia connected to the pressing responsibility characteristic of the ruling classes. The Virgilian model serves as intermediary between the Greek poets and Flavian poetry.[9]

During the massacre of Lemnos, already celebrated for the predominance of sleep in the episode,[10] Hypsipyle exclaims of her father, as Thoas is already awake and immersed in the anxieties of the surrounding noise and turmoil: *quis magna tuenti / somnus?* ("what sleep for him that has great charge?" Stat. *Theb*. 5.241–242). Likewise, as Hannibal in Gades finds rest in sleep (*belligeramque datur somno componere mentem*, "and he was able to rest his warlike mind in sleep," Sil. 3.162), Mercury proclaims that it is repugnant for a leader to pass the whole night in a sleep that wards off the duties of a leader, instead of being involved in war: *turpe duci totam somno consumere noctem, / o rector Libyae. uigili*[11] *stant bella magistro* ("Ruler of Libya, it becomes not a leader to pass the whole night in slumber: war prospers when the commander wakes," Sil. 3.172–173). There are differences between the two passages. In Statius, the rhetorical interrogative results in a simple aside that comments on the action without exhortation; the structure of the dialogue remains within the human sphere; the figure of the *dux* is that of an old man who still has not realized the enormity of the situation but, almost as if

8 See Vessey (1973) 41.

9 Cf. *Aen*. 1.305.

10 See in particular the scene of quiet and sleep in Lemnos (*morituram … urbem*, *Theb*. 5.198), except for the women possessed by a homicidal *furor* (5.195–201).

11 For the link *uigil … magister* in Latin poetry, cf. V. Fl. 8.202.

sleeplessness alerted him to a kind of sixth sense, he spontaneously leaves sleep and recoups energy for the action. Conversely, in Silius the urging call to wakefulness has an effect of even greater strength and authority; it is the divine figure of Mercury that dissuades the Punic leader from rest, when the latter is already immersed in war. Despite these differences, however, in these two passages it is the leaders, statesmen, or those responsible for war who do not sleep or who are expected not to sleep.

The primary source on which the Flavian poets draw comes from the long scene in Homer's second book of the *Iliad* (2.1–47)[12] in which, while everyone else sleeps, Zeus is unable to succumb to sleep, overcome by thoughts of how to honor Achilles. In this passage, it is worth highlighting[13] how, through a nightmare to Agamemnon, Zeus himself clearly indicates why a hero should not sleep an entire night:[14]

> εὕδεις, Ἀτρέος υἱὲ δαΐφρονος ἱπποδάμοιο·
> οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὕδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα,
> ᾧ λαοί τ᾽ ἐπιτετράφαται καὶ τόσσα μέμηλε.[15] (Hom. *Il.* 2.23–25)
>
> You sleep, son of battle-minded Atreus, tamer of horses. A man that is counselor must not sleep the whole night through, one to whom an army has been entrusted, and on whom rest so many cares.

The action of divine punishment is echoed by the passage quoted above from the *Punica* (3.172–173); the Homeric diction βουληφόρον ἄνδρα, / ᾧ λαοί τ᾽ ἐπιτετράφαται καὶ τόσσα μέμηλε (24–25) creates a tricolon that multiplies the theme of masculine responsibility, of the burden of worries connected to duty, and of the necessity of a "positive" sleeplessness, characterized by an anxiety of reality control but also desired and sustained by the requirements of efficiency.

From our analysis of these passages, the wakefulness of leaders proves to be an extremely rich theme in the Flavian poets, a useful channel for verifying the constant influence of the character of Odysseus in the Greco-Roman tradition. In Homer, Odysseus is very often portrayed as a sleepless hero,[16] albeit happily so, as the character himself proudly declares:[17]

---

12 On the relationship between Silius and Homer, see Manuwald (2007) 82–90.

13 On the relationship between the *Iliad* and Valerius, see Fucecchi (2006) 65–66.

14 See Kirk (1985) 122.

15 See Kirk (1985) 117.

16 Cf. Hom. *Od.* 10.476–481; 12.31–35; 20.1–97; on the last passage, see Rutherford (1992) 200–201.

17 There is no allusion to the strong connotation of Odysseus as sleepless in this passage in Rutherford (1992), apart from a brief note (177).

ὦ γύναι αἰδοίη Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος,
ἦ τοι ἐμοὶ χλαῖναι καὶ ῥήγεα σιγαλόεντα
ἤχθεθ', ὅτε πρῶτον Κρήτης ὄρεα νιφόεντα
νοσφισάμην ἐπὶ νηὸς ἰὼν δολιχηρέτμοιο,
κείω δ' ὡς τὸ πάρος περ ἀΰπνους νύκτας ἴαυον·
πολλὰς γὰρ δὴ νύκτας ἀεικελίῳ ἐνὶ κοίτῃ
ἄεσα καί τ' ἀνέμεινα ἐΰθρονον Ἠῶ δῖαν. (Hom. *Od.* 19.336–342)

Revered wife of Odysseus, son of Laertes, know that cloaks and bright coverlets became hateful in my eyes on the day when first I left behind me the snowy mountains of Crete, as I traveled on my long-oared ship. I will lie as in time past I rested through sleepless nights; for many a night have I lain upon a poor bed and waited for the bright-throned Dawn.

The insomnia of this "fake" Odysseus is characterized by the clear and simple expression ἀΰπνους νύκτας (340); the more generic expression in the following verse, πολλὰς γὰρ δὴ νύκτας (341), repeats and modifies the previous expression. The pathos of the sleepless protagonist in the tale is intensified by the mention of the pallet on which he is lying, unable to sleep and waiting for daybreak.

In Statius, the astuteness of an insomniac Odysseus is taken a step further: the Ithacan does not sleep because he detests sleep. We find therefore a complex but effective allusion of the Greek model:

cetera depositis Lycomedis regia curis
tranquilla sub pace[18] silet, sed longa sagaci
nox Ithaco, lucemque cupit[19] somnumque grauatur.[20] (Stat. *Ach.* 1.816–818)

The rest of Lycomedes' palace is silent in tranquil peace. But for the sagacious Ithacan the night is long: he yearns for the day-light, chafing at slumber.

The consonance of the two passages is such as to seem an intentional allusion.[21] The expression *grauare somnum* (*Ach.* 1.818) corresponds to the longer Homeric expression ἦ τοι ἐμοὶ χλαῖναι καὶ ῥήγεα σιγαλόεντα / ἤχθεθ' (*Od.* 19.337–338); Homer prefers the concreteness of the "cloaks and bright coverlets" (metonymy) instead of the sleep of Odysseus in Statius, which is depicted as a more abstract concept. Furthermore, the Homeric expression ἀνέμεινα ἐΰθρονον Ἠῶ δῖαν (*Od.* 19.342) matches the Latin *lucemque cupit*

18 For a similar expression, cf. Stat. *Ach.* 1.807–808.

19 One sees a variation on the theme of the breaking of dawn in Stat. *Theb.* 7.463–465.

20 Cf. Sil. 10.330–331.

21 The link with Homer has not been noted in any of the following studies: Juhnke (1972) 371–375; Ripoll (2008) 260; Dilke (2009^3) 135; Nuzzo (2012) 147.

(*Ach.* 1.818). Considering the epithets of the characters, the famous πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς (*Od.* 19.335) corresponds to Statius' syntagm *sagaci … Ithaco* (*Ach.* 1.817–818). It is exactly this astuteness that incorporates sleeplessness in a lively, quick-paced narrative.

Furthermore, of the three Flavian poets, Silius develops this theme the most:[22] the true commander sacrifices the time usually dedicated to sleep in order to meditate, act, and fight, as Hannibal does in both Livy[23] and Silius:

> … nec cetera segnis,
> quaecumque ad laudem stimulant, somnumque negabat
> naturae noctemque uigil ducebat in armis. (Sil. 1.244–246)

> In all other things that spur a man on to glory he was untiring: denying sleep to nature, he would pass the whole night armed and awake.

In this case, sleeplessness is constructed around the correspondence between antithetical adjectives (*segnis*, 244 ~ *uigil*, 246), but the particle *nec* inverts the sense of the adjective *segnis* to make it signify an activity, opposed to indolence and sleep.

In an antithetical mirroring of the relationship of the commander to the topos of the sleepless soldier, Silius develops a negative sleep motif that corresponds to languor and weakness, inactivity and lust, that is, all the characteristics to be avoided by soldiers. As such it occurs in the speech of Voluptas to Scipio:

> at si me comitere, puer, non limite duro
> iam tibi decurrat concessi temporis aetas.
> haud umquam trepidos abrumpet bucina somnos,[24]
> non glaciem Arctoam, non experiere furentis
> ardorem Cancri nec mensas saepe cruento
> gramine compositas. aberunt sitis aspera et haustus
> sub galea puluis †partique minore† labores. (Sil. 15.46–52)

---

22 Cf. Sil. 7.154–158 and 282–287; 9.1–8; 10.326–333; 12.558–564.

23 Cf. Liv. 21.4.6–7: *uigiliarum somnique nec die nec nocte discriminata tempora; id quod gerendis rebus superesset quieti datum; ea neque molli strato neque silentio accersita; multi saepe militari sagulo opertum humi iacentem inter custodias stationesque militum conspexerunt* ("His times of waking and sleeping were not marked off by day or night: what time remained when his work was done he gave to sleep, which he did not court with a soft bed or stillness, but was seen repeatedly by many lying on the ground wrapped in a common soldier's cloack amongst the sentinels and outguards"); see also the characterization of the sleepless Catilina in Sal. *Cat.* 5.3 and 13.3–4.

24 Spaltenstein (1990) 342 suggests a generic similarity between *trepidos somnos* here and *trepidus sopor* in Stat. *Ach.* 1.129.

> But if you follow me, my son, then your allotted term of life will move along no rugged path. Never will the trumpet break your troubled sleep; you will not feel the northern cold nor the fierce heat of Cancer nor the pangs of thirst, nor take your meal many a time on the blood-stained turf, nor gulp down the dust behind your helmet, nor (?) hardship.

The theme is here reversed and is seen again in the counterproposal of Virtus to the Punic *dux*, when she reaffirms once and for all the tie between the lack of sleep and the competence of a capable leader:

> stramine proiectus duro patiere sub astris
> insomnes noctes frigusque famemque domabis.
> idem iustitiae cultor, quaecumque capesses,
> testes factorum stare arbitrabere diuos. (Sil. 15.109–112)

> Lying on a hard bed of straw, you will endure sleepless nights under the stars, and you will master cold and hunger. Also you will worship justice in all your doings and believe that the gods stand and witness your every action.

Limite duro (46), *stramine duro* (109): the two speeches echo each other in the *duritia* typical of Virtus' lifestyle, which involves the process of interruption of rest by disturbing dreams[25] and insomnia, adding hunger and cold to sleeplessness in a partially alliterative tricolon (*insomnes noctes frigusque famemque*,[26] 110). The expression *glaciem … Arctoam* in line 49 corresponds to the cold of line 110. And finally, as confirmation of these recurring themes in Statius and Silius, it is worth noting that *Voluptas* is connected to *Somnus* in Stat. *Theb*. 10.101, since she lives in his house.

A variation of the theme under examination is presented in a passage in the *Punica*, when Venus strikes the Carthaginian camp with endless idleness:[27]

> amplexu[28] multoque mero somnoque uirorum
> profliganda acies, quam non perfregerit ensis,
> non ignes, non immissis Gradiuus habenis. (Sil. 11.397–399)

> With dalliance, with excess of wine and sleep, you must rout an army that neither sword nor fire could shatter, nor the chariot of Mars with its utmost speed.

Here the sleeplessness of a single leader becomes the collective sleeplessness of an army to be tamed by various means (397–398), among which sleep

---

25 See Harris (2009) 56 n. 175.
26 On this expression, see Littlewood in this volume, p. 272.
27 See Littlewood in this volume, pp. 271–272.
28 See Spaltenstein (1990) 131.

turns out to be more potent than swords, flames, or even, hyperbolically, Mars himself (398–399). This image of an invincible sleep matches Silius' description in 10.337–374, where we also encounter epithets that describe sleep as "lord of the silent darkness" (*quietis / regnantem tenebris*, 340–341) or gifted with soft wings (344), capable of subduing even Jupiter (345) or Argus (345–346).

If we turn to two passages in Statius, we will find a theme similar to that previously surveyed, which concerns insomnia of another sort, that of the helmsman: the person who steers a ship, just as the man who leads an army, does not sleep. If in the case of Homer the helmsman is exemplified by the leader Odysseus, the Latin poets loosely mix the correlation of the two figures, at times presenting the insomniacs as simple helmsmen, who have been given a responsibility similar to that of controlling war or an emergency situation. In Statius, like a helmsman, Adrastus is justly and virtuously sleepless:

cetera Graiorum curis armisque iacebat
fessa cohors; alto castrorum ex aggere Adrastus
laetificos tenui captabat corde tumultus,
quamquam aeger senio, sed agit miseranda potestas
inuigilare[29] malis. illum aereus undique clamor
Thebanique urunt sonitus, et amara lacessit
tibia, tum nimio uoces marcore superbae
incertaeque faces et iam male peruigil[30] ignis.
sic ubi per fluctus uno ratis obruta somno
conticuit, tantique maris secura iuuentus
mandauere animas: solus stat puppe magister
peruigil inscriptaque deus qui nauigat alno. (Stat. *Theb.* 8.259–270)

The rest of the Grecian army lay wearied with care and combat. From the camp's high rampart Adrastus listened with faint heart to the joyous uproar, sick though he was with the sickness of old age; but pitiable power drives him to vigilance in misfortune. Brazen clamor from all sides chafes him, sounds of Thebes, and the bitter pipe provokes, along with insolent cries of drunkenness and wavering torches and fires scarce lasting out of the night. So when at sea a ship has fallen silent sunk in a single sleep and the trusting crew have handed

29 Cf. *Theb.* 8.623–624.

30 The word *peruigil* is used twice in this section (266, 270); the adjective translates the Greek παννύχιος and is the equivalent of the more common *uigil*. As Mulder (1954) 224 points out, it is often used in imperial Latin poetry. It is a highly poetic lexeme used also by Ovid, Seneca, and Lucan (cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.6.44; *Met.* 10.369; Sen. *Her. F.* 809; *Med.* 703; Luc. 4.7) and by all Flavians (Stat. *Silu.* 4.5.13; *Theb.* 3.690, 10.129, 12.150; V. Fl. 1.481, 3.76, 4.286, 5.141 and 603, 7.9 and 341).

> over their lives careless of the great sea, the helmsman stands wakeful in the poop alone, he and the god who sails on the vessel inscribed with his name.

Different themes are interwoven in this passage: Adrastus is a single insomniac character within the context of collective sleep (259–261);[31] he represents the old leader kept awake by thoughts of the outcome of the war (262–263);[32] and he is like the helmsman who, *solus peruigil* (269–270), when everyone else is asleep (267–268), is placed next to god who protects the ship and whose name the boat carries. By means of sleeplessness, this passage neatly connects the two typologies, of the leader and the helmsman in charge of a group of men.[33]

3. *Helmsmen and Stars*

I argue here that Statius recasts the motif of the helmsman *peruigil*, first amply developed by Homer:

> γηθόσυνος δ' οὔρῳ πέτασ' ἱστία δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.
> αὐτὰρ ὁ πηδαλίῳ ἰθύνετο τεχνηέντως
> ἥμενος, οὐδέ οἱ ὕπνος ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἔπιπτε
> Πληϊάδας τ' ἐσορῶντι καὶ ὀψὲ δύοντα Βοώτην
> Ἄρκτον θ', ἣν καὶ ἄμαξαν ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν,
> ἥ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται καί τ' Ὠρίωνα δοκεύει,
> οἴη δ' ἄμμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο· (Hom. *Od.* 5.269–275)

> Gladly then did goodly Odysseus spread his sail to the breeze; and he sat and guided his raft skillfully with the steering-oar, nor did sleep fall upon his eyelids, as he watched the Pleiads, and late-setting Bootes, and the Bear, which men also call the Wain, which ever circles where it is and watches Orion, and alone has no part in the baths of Ocean.

The connection between insomnia and the action of piloting a ship gives space to another topic, namely the contemplation of the stars.

A variation in which Odysseus the helmsman falls asleep is found in *Od.* 13.73–95, with the parallel of Virgil's Palinurus as a probable echo or simply

---

31 See Cozzolino (2004) and Fucecchi (2006) 65.

32 See the discussion of *Theb.* 5.241–242 above, pp. 14–15.

33 The two figures are also juxtaposed in *Aen.* 10.215–218: *iamque dies caelo concesserat almaque curru / noctiuago Phoebe medium pulsabat Olympum*: / *Aeneas* (*neque enim membris dat cura quietem*) / *ipse sedens clauumque regit uelisque ministrat* ("And now day had passed from the sky and gracious Phoebe was trampling mid-heaven with her night-roving steeds; Aeneas, for care allows no rest to his limbs, sat at his post, his own hand guiding the rudder and tending the sails").

the resumption of the generic model (*Aen.* 5.835–871). This type is also found in Valerius Flaccus; Tiphys, the man who should steer the ship but instead falls asleep, brings about an unforeseen turn in the narrative:

> nox erat et leni canebant aequora sulco
> et iam prona leues spargebant sidera somnos.
> aura uehit, religant tonsas ueloque Procneson
> et te iam medio flauentem, Rhyndace, ponto
> spumosumque legunt fracta Scylaceon ab unda.
> ipse diem longe solisque cubilia Tiphys
> consulit, ipse ratem uento stellisque ministrat.[34]
> atque illum non ante sopor luctamine tanto
> lenit agens diuum imperiis. cadit inscia clauo
> dextera demittitque oculos solataque puppis
> turbine flectit iter portuque refertur amico. (V. Fl. 3.32–42)

> It was night, and the sea was white on the ship's smooth track, and the stars, declining now, were scattering gentle sleep abroad. A breeze bears the ship on; they make fast their oars, and sailing pass by Proconnesus and by you, Rhyndacus, whose stream is still tawny in mid-sea, and Scylaceum where the waves break into foam. With his own eyes Tiphys marks far off the daylight and the sun's setting, with his own hand he sets the ship to wind and stars. But Sleep at the bidding of the gods weighs upon him as never before and lulls him to rest from his heavy travail; unwitting his hand slips from the tiller, his eyes droop, and unpiloted the ship, caught in a puff of wind, turns its course full circle and is borne back to the friendly harbor.

This is a quiet night at sea (32–33: one could note the presence of two adjectives indicating lightness, such as *lenis* and *leuis*, and the motion of the waves via the alliteration of the phoneme /s/). In the beginning, Tiphys steers the ship and therefore does not sleep (37–38), and then is struck, as if in a struggle (*luctamine*, 39), by god-sent sleep, whose arrival is fully described (40–41). The unpiloted ship turns its course full circle and is borne back to the friendly land of the Doliones.

This passage is an example of a deviation from the topos of the insomniac helmsman, as previously exemplified by Tiphys in the *Argonautica*. Immediately after his death,[35] his sleepless service is highlighted in Jason's speech:[36]

---

[34] Spaltenstein (2004) 17 highlights the relationship between the helmsmen Palinurus and Tiphys and the expression *non ante … luctamine tanto*.

[35] On the death of Tiphys, see Krasne's and Van der Schuur's essays in this volume, pp. 35 and 95–112.

[36] Cf. Spaltenstein (2004) 399–400 who notes that "la veille attentive du pilote est topique." See also Wijsman (1996) 35.

... nec summa speculantem puppe uidebo
Pleiadumque globos et agentes noctibus Arctos?
cui Minyas caramque ratem, cui sidera tradis?
carpere securas quis iam iubet Aesona noctes?
hoc labor, hoc dulci totiens fraudata sopore[37]
lumina et admotis nimium mens anxia Colchis
profuit? ... (V. Fl. 5.45–51)

Am I not to see you watching from the high poop the clustering Pleiads and the nightly guidance of the Bear? To whom do you bequeath the Minyans and the beloved vessel and the stars? Who now bids Aeson sleep peacefully of nights? Is this the reward your toil has won, and your eyes so often cheated of sweet slumber, and your anxious care as the Colchians drew near? ...

4. *Festivities and Wakefulness*

In Greek and Latin epic poetry, we encounter many forms of insomnia, one that affects populations, armies, and also smaller groups of people. In that sense, we also find traditional theme of sleeplessness when people participate in a feast or collective rite and thus pass the entire night in social activity. Sleeplessness then becomes a joyful condition. The theme first occurs in Homer's *Iliad*, where, however, the co-existence of joy and negative feelings conclude with restorative sleep:

... τίθεντο δὲ δαῖτα θάλειαν.
παννύχιοι μὲν ἔπειτα κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ
δαίνυντο, Τρῶες δὲ κατὰ πτόλιν ἠδ' ἐπίκουροι·
παννύχιος δέ σφιν κακὰ μήδετο μητίετα Ζεὺς
σμερδαλέα κτυπέων. τοὺς δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ᾕρει·
οἶνον δ' ἐκ δεπάων χαμάδις χέον, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
πρὶν πιέειν, πρὶν λεῖψαι ὑπερμενέι Κρονίωνι.
κοιμήσαντ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ὕπνου δῶρον ἕλοντο. (Hom. *Il.* 7.475–482)

And they prepared a rich feast. So the whole night through the long-haired Achaeans feasted, and the Trojans likewise in the city, and their allies; and all night long Zeus, the counselor, devised them evil, thundering terrifyingly. Then pale fear seized them, and they let the wine flow from their cups on to the ground, and no man dared drink until he had made a drink offering to the son of Cronus, supreme in might. Then they laid them down and took the gift of sleep.

---

[37] The participle *fraudatus* is a typical term in imperial Latin poetry (Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.251; *Theb.* 6.186; Sil. 14.513). In relation to sleep we only find it in this context (V. Fl. 5.49), as Wijsman (1996) 38 notes.

The anaphora of the adjective παννύχιος again duplicates the sleepless condition of the humans (the two armies) and of the gods (Zeus). Not by chance, the conclusion coincides with the end of the book, and only after a shared libation dedicated to god, with the gift of sleep which lays the men flat. The strong presence of a deity, in particular Zeus, in the scene of the sleepless night dedicated to collective festivities inspires later epic poets, as we can see in Virgil for instance (*Aen.* 9.165–175).

Statius elaborates on this theme, both in the *Thebaid* and the *Siluae*. In the first part of the second book of the epic poem, there are multiple references to sleep as the Theban peasants (and with them Cithaeron) celebrate Bacchus in an *insomnem noctem*;[38] other scenes of collective sleeplessness during a feast under the aegis of a divinity later on in the poem will allude to this scene:

> et tunc forte dies noto signata Tonantis
> fulmine, praerepti cum te, tener Euhie, partus
> transmisere patri. Tyriis ea causa colonis
> insomnem ludo[39] certatim educere noctem[40]
> suaserat; effusi passim per tecta, per agros,
> serta inter uacuosque mero crateras anhelum
> proflabant sub luce deum;[41] tunc plurima buxus
> aeraque taurinos sonitu uincentia pulsus;
> ipse etiam gaudens nemorosa per auia sanas
> impulerat matres Baccho meliore Cithaeron:
> qualia per Rhodopen rabido conuiuia coetu
> Bistones aut mediae ponunt conuallibus Ossae;
> illis semianimum pecus excussaeque leonum
> ore dapes et lacte nouo domuisse cruorem
> luxus; at Ogygii si quando afflauit Iacchi
> saeuus odor, tunc saxa manu, tunc pocula pulchrum
> spargere et inmerito sociorum sanguine fuso
> instaurare diem festasque reponere mensas. (Stat. *Theb.* 2.71–88)

> It chanced to be the day marked by the Thunderer's famed bolt when you forestalled delivery, tender Euhius, handed you over to your father. That gave the Tyrian settlers their reason to draw out a sleepless night in sportive rivalry. Stretched everywhere, indoors or in the fields, amid garlands and empty wine bowls they were exhaling the panting god as day approached. Then sounded

[38] Cf. *Theb.* 2.30–31 (Mercury puts Cerberus to sleep) and 59–61 (Sleep comes to Mercury).

[39] The justapoxition of the nouns *nox* and *ludus*, often accompanied by the verb *ducere* or *educere*, is therefore typical in Flavian poetry; see Mulder (1954) 77; Zissos (2008) 205.

[40] The phrase *insomnis nox* is used only sparingly in Latin poetry. More specifically, it only occurs from the *Aeneid* onward. On Virg. *Aen.* 9.166–167, see Hardie (1994) 105.

[41] On the problematic *anhelum ... deum*, see Mulder (1954) 78.

> many a boxwood pipe and cymbals louder than the beating of bull-hide. Cithaeron himself had merrily driven sane mothers through the wooded wilds under a kinder Bacchus. Such feasts do Bistones in wild assembly lay out on Rhodope or amid Ossa's vales; for them a sheep half living, food shaken from lion's jaws, and blood diluted with new milk is luxury; but if ever the fierce odor of Ogygian Iacchus breathes upon them, then they love to scatter stones and wine-cups, and after spilling guiltless blood of comrades to begin the day afresh and reset the festal boards.

From the viewpoint of a generic recurrence of themes in Greek and Latin epic,[42] it would be opportune to make some comparative reflections. Homer produces a complex scene in which there is no allusion to insomnia except through a series of actions that happen through the night (παννύχιοι μὲν ἔπειτα κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ / δαίνυντο, Τρῶες δὲ κατὰ πτόλιν ἠδ' ἐπίκουροι· / παννύχιος δέ σφιν κακὰ μήδετο μητίετα Ζεύς, *Il.* 7.476–478); conversely, Statius specifically uses the adjective *insomnis* to define the night (*insomnem ludo certatim educere noctem / suaserat, Theb.* 2.74–75). Whereas the divinity in Homer assumes sinister connotations that bring about reverence and terror (τοὺς δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ᾕρει· / οἶνον δ' ἐκ δεπάων χαμάδις χέον, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη / πρὶν πιέειν πρὶν λεῖψαι ὑπερμενέι Κρονίωνι, *Il.* 7.479–481), Statius proposes an image of a positive divinity (*ipse etiam gaudens nemorosa per auia sanas / impulerat matres Baccho meliore Cithaeron, Theb.* 2.79–80).[43] The detailed tale of the festivity of the Theban peasants in honor of Bacchus is built around a double reference to sleep and sleeplessness: there is the decision to have an "uninterrupted" sleepless night, involving all the Thebans, without specifying the beginning or the end (2.74–75); in addition, the poet portrays the sleep of Eteocles next, who is rudely and traumatically interrupted by Mercury's horrific intervention disguised as Laius (*Theb.* 2.125–133).

In an interesting recurrence of the same theme in the *Siluae*, once again we find Bacchus, sleeplessness, and an exceptional feast:[44]

> uixdum caerula nox subibat orbem,
> escendit media nitens harena
> densas flammeus orbis inter umbras
> uincens Cnosiacae facem coronae.
> collucet polus ignibus nihilque
> obscurae patitur licere nocti.

---

42 For a similar scene, cf. V. Fl. 1.274–285. For a rich and detailed comment to the passage, which nonetheless does not touch on the theme of sleeplessness, see Zissos (2008) 214–219 and cf. V. Fl. 2.579–582.

43 On the role of Bacchus in the *Thebaid*, see Criado (2000) 51–72.

44 See Newlands (2002) 227–259 and Sacerdoti (2011).

fugit pigra Quies[45] inersque[46] Somnus
haec cernens alias abit in urbes.
quis spectacula, quis iocos licentes,[47]
quis conuiuia, quis dapes inemptas,
largi flumina quis canat Lyaei?
iamiam deficio tuoque Baccho …
in serum trahor ebrius saporem. (Stat. *Silu.* 1.6.85–97)

Scarcely was dim night advancing upon the world when a flaming ball ascends from the center of the arena shining in the dense gloom, surpassing the flare of the Cretan crown. The sky brightens with flames, allowing no license to night's obscurity. At the sight lazy Rest and Sleep must take off for other cities. Who should sing the shows, the unbridled jests, the banquets, the viands unbought, the rivers of lavish Lyaeus? Now, now my strength fails and your Bacchus draws me tipsy into tardy slumber.

Especially in the first part of this poem, Statius showcases the antithesis between insomnia and sleep, light and darkness, the order of a normal day and the disorder ruled by the *Saturnalia principis* (82). These opposites underscore the contrast between play and severity: the noun *iocos* (93) is also used in the context of insomnia in *Silu.* 4.6.13–14.[48] In the same way, to mark a recurrence of themes between the Flavians, wakefulness is associated with festive and collective play in both Stat. *Theb.* 2.73–75 and V. Fl. 2.581–582.

In *Silu.* 1, 6 the joy for the feast mixes with the paradox of a reversed order specifically involving night and day, sleep and sleeplessness, to culminate in a further upending of the wakefulness that dominates the ending of the poem, which coincides with the advent of sleep for the poet (93–97).[49] I

---

[45] For the phrase *pigra quies*, cf. *Silu.* 2.2.7 and 2.3.6. For the collocation of *pigra obliuio* with the noun *quies*, cf. *Silu.* 1.4.57 and *Theb.* 10.89.

[46] The adjective *iners* is also associated with *somnus* in *Theb.* 2.129, discussed above. On the use of the adjective in Virgil, see Jackson (1996). Statius uses the lexeme extensively and in general employs the negative sense of the term, but in several passages he gives it a positive meaning (*Theb.* 11.484).

[47] Note the insistence of the theme of the *licentia*, with the infinitive *licere* (90) and the participle *licentes* (93).

[48] Both Coleman (1988) 179 and Bonadeo (2010) 182 discuss the influence of Callimachus and Catullus on *Silu.* 4.6.12–13, but they do not refer to "literary sleeplessness" as a specific theme.

[49] Scioli (2005) 203 shares some of my conclusions: "Somnus and Quies are active, decisive gods, while *sopor* is a state which someone achieves as a result of extreme exhaustion or inebriation. Even though Somnus and Quies have fled the scene, *sopor* is still an option for the weary. In this case, *sopor* is unnatural sleep, or sleep induced by external forces. Its usage reinforces the contrast between natural and unnatural, expectation and surprise, which are the themes of the Saturnalia itself."

argue that the idea of the distortion of the natural rhythms of day and night, typical to *Silu.* 1.6, creates a full circle with the *Thebaid*, specifically in the characterization of the female figures of the twelfth book. Consider, for instance, Argia's march which involves the heavy alteration of the normal rhythms of nightly sleep:

> iam pater Hesperio flagrantem gurgite currum
> abdiderat Titan, aliis rediturus ab undis,
> cum tamen illa grauem luctu fallente laborem
> nescit abisse diem … (Stat. *Theb.* 12.228–231)
>
> Already had father Titan had his flaming chariot in the Hesperian flood, to emerge again from other waves, yet she, her weary toil beguiled by grief, knows not that the day is ended …

In comparing female figures (e. g., the sleeplessness of the poet's wife in *Silu.* 3.5 is diametrically opposite to that of Argia and Antigone), I submit, insomnia becomes an important medium for understanding Statian poetics.

5. *Literary Sleeplessness and Other Themes in the* Siluae

Sleep and sleeplessness are recurring themes in Statius' occasional poetry, even though his debt to the Homeric tradition in the *Siluae* is subjugated to that of the Greco-Roman lyric poets.[50] For instance, in *Siluae* 5.4, Statius offers us an original case of wakefulness, that of the autobiographical sleeplessness of the poet, for reasons left unexplained.[51]

In *Siluae* 3.5, we learn that the poet's wife does not sleep, but for reasons clearly not analogous with those traditionally associated with women in epic poetry:[52] *quid mihi maesta die, sociis quid noctibus, uxor, / anxia peruigili ducis suspiria cura?* ("Why, my wife, do you sorrow by day and fetch painful sighs in the nights we share, in sleepless worry?" *Silu.* 3.5.1–2).[53] This

---

50 On the use of Greek lyric poetry in the *Siluae*, see Bonadeo (2007) 160–176.

51 On this poem, which has enjoyed noticable attention in the last decade, see Cozzolino (2004); Gibson (2006) 379–392; Scioli (2005) 263 and 274; and most recently Augoustakis (2008) with further bibliography. On the later fortune of the poem, see Cunningham (1948) 359–371 and Abbamonte (2011).

52 In addition to the "masculine" insomnia studied thus far, there is also the sleeplessness associated with women in love, troubled, worried, or active: e.g., Penelope (*Od.* 19.508–517), Medea (A. R. 3.744–760 and 4.1058–1072; V. Fl. 6.752–760 and 7.1–27); Antigone (*Theb.* 12.354–361) and Argia (*Theb.* 12.222–446); Thetis (*Ach.* 1.228–231); and the wife of Statius in *Silu.* 3.5.1–35.

53 Cf. Sil. 8.209.

provocative *incipit* of the poem points to the strong presence of sleeplessness because of sadness during the day (*maesta*, 1; *triste*, 14). Elsewhere in the poem, in a list praising the beauties of Naples, Statius employs words generally associated with peace, quiet, and sleep (*pax secura locis et desidis otia uitae / et numquam turbata quies somnique peracti*, "peace secure is there, the leisure of a quiet life, tranquillity indisturbed, sleep that runs its course," 85–86). As for his wife, Claudia, he reserves some of the most original pieces:

> … tu procurrentia primis
> carmina nostra sonis, totasque in murmure noctes
> aure rapis uigili … (Stat. *Silu.* 3.5.33–35)

> It is you that catch with sleepless ear the first notes of my songs as they run forth and whole nights of murmuring.

The principal characteristic of wakefulness in the *Siluae* is in fact precisely the kind of insomnia that I would define as "literary," one that has its roots in the previous lyric and elegiac tradition.[54] In epic poetry, sleeping is abandoned for the pleasure of narrating and listening (Hom. *Od.* 11.373–381, 15.390–397, 19.588–604; A. R. 2.448–450; V. Fl. 2.349–353; Sil. 8.134–139; and of course, the entire second and third books of Virgil's *Aeneid*, narrated during the night). In Statius' occasional poetry, we can find an original, strong vision of literary sleeplessness, the sleeplessness of the person who dedicates himself to writing, reading, or listening to poetry.[55]

Similarly, in the fourth book of the *Siluae*, sleeping is replaced by time spent discussing poetry:

> nobis uerus amor medioque Helicone petitus
> sermo hilaresque ioci brumalem absumere noctem
> suaserunt mollemque oculis expellere somnum,[56]
> donec ab Elysiis prospexit sedibus alter
> Castor et hesternas risit Tithonia mensas. (Stat. *Silu.* 4.6.12–16)

> True affection and talk sought from the heart of Helicon and many jests induced us to exhaust a winter's night and banish soft sleep from our eyes until the other Castor looked out from Elysian abode and Tithonia laughed at yesterday's board.

---

54 See Scioli (2005) 265.

55 See Newlands (2002) 121.

56 In Coleman (1988) 179–180, there is no discussion of the expression *mollis somnus* in this passage, which corresponds to the typical Homeric formula γλυκερὸς ὕπνος. In Virgil, as Moya (1996) 941 observes, "*mollis* è il sonno dei contadini (*G.* 2.470) e dolce quello dell'uomo che rende onori agli dei (1, 342)."

These lines are contrasted to an earlier passage concerning the type of conversation centered around dry and uninteresting details: *a miseri, quos nosse iuuat quid Phasidis ales / distet ab hiberna Rhodopes grue, quis magis anser / exta ferat, cur Tuscus aper generosior Vmbro, / lubrica qua recubent conchylia mollius alga* ("ah, wretched are they that care to know how the bird of Phasis differs from Rhodope's winter crane, what goose gives offal rather than another, why the Tuscan boar is nobler than the Umbrian, what seaweed makes the most comfortable bed for slippery shellfish," *Silu.* 4.6.8–11): this attitude towards culture is rejected in favor of a *sermo* sought from Helicon (12–13), which envisages also a desired sleeplessness, not only one of anxiety. Commanders or helmsmen of the epic poems enjoy sleepless nights dedicated to war or navigation; for the lyric poet and his circle, *poetry* is the passion, a supreme activity that can justify lack of sleep.

Conversely, the slumber of Manlius Vopiscus is steeped in poetry:

> ipse Anien (miranda fides!), infraque superque
> saxeus, hic tumidam rabiem saxosaque ponit
> murmura, ceu placidi ueritus turbare Vopisci
> Pieriosque dies et habentes carmina somnos.[57] (Stat. *Silu.* 1.3.20–23)

> Anio himself, wondrous to tell, full of rocks above and below, here rests his swollen rage and rocky din, as though loath to disturb Vopiscus' Pierian days and song-filled slumber.

Statius insistently puts forward the theme that connects sleep and poetry, a special characteristic of the poetics of sleeplessness in the *Siluae*. In the same vein, we can read a passage in *Siluae* 4.4, in which, after having discussed the place and vivacious activity of the person to whom the poem is dedicated, Statius claims that he prefers his own personal *otium*:[58]

> en, egomet somnum et geniale secutus
> litus, ubi Ausonio se condidit hospita portu
> Parthenope, tenues[59] ignauo pollice chordas
> pulso Maroneique sedens in margine templi
> sumo animum et magni tumulis adcanto magistri ... (Stat. *Silu.* 4.4.51–55)

---

57 Newlands (2002) 135–138 notes the connection between poetry and sleep. Corti (1991) 192–195 comments on the Epicurean tone.

58 See Corti (1991) on *otium* in the *Siluae*. Coleman (1988) 147 mentions the link between quiet and literary activity.

59 Also looking at the adjectives employed, one will note that the adjective *tenuis* (here modifying *chordas*) is elsewhere often used to describe sleep (Stat. *Theb.* 1.389, 2.145–146, 7.463). As Coleman (1988) 147 points out *tenuis ... chordas* resonates with the Callimachean λεπτότης. More generally, details such as this reinforce the theory of unified poetics within the various works of Statius.

> Look! Pursuing sleep and the genial shore where stranger Parthenope found refuge in Ausonian haven, I idly strike the slender strings; sitting on the verge of Maro's shrine, I take heart and sing at the tomb of the great master.

6. *Conclusions*

From the typological classification we have developed in this essay, it emerges that the Flavians have extensively developed further the theme of insomnia through the Greek models but also Virgil, Sallust, and Livy. Our analysis of intertextual connections and thematic correspondences has demonstrated how Homer becomes the hypotext and a generic model for the construction of the identity of the sleeplessness of both leaders and helmsmen. In the *Siluae*, sleep and sleeplessness reveal on the one hand an insistence on the theme of cosmic distortion of natural and biological rhythms and on the other hand the dynamics of continuity and diffraction, when compared to the epic poems of Statius. An insomnia linked to literary activities is also of crucial importance, in the manner of poetics that indissolubly connect the open time of night to poetry, friendship, *sermo*, and the *hilares ioci*, which can be summed up as the refined *lusus* of a circle of intellectuals that voluntarily refuse the advent of a gentle sleep, like the far and near heroes of the epics.

PART II

VALERIUS FLACCUS

WHEN THE ARGO MET THE ARGO: POETIC DESTRUCTION IN VALERIUS' *ARGONAUTICA*[*]

Darcy Krasne

Early in the first book of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*, the poet dedicates twenty-eight lines to the construction and decoration of the Argo (V. Fl. 1.121–148). This was a topic that Apollonius Rhodius had eschewed as a hackneyed theme of song, although glimpses of the Argo's construction are subsequently visible throughout the Hellenistic epic.[1] Valerius, however, not only chooses to tread this well-trodden ground but even calls attention to his belated rendition of the construction scene in several ways. Of these, the most pertinent to my argument here is the scene's opening:

> feruere cuncta uirum coetu, simul undique cernit
> delatum nemus et docta resonare bipenni
> litora. iam pinus gracili dissoluere lamna
> Thespiaden iungique latus lentoque sequaces
> molliri uidet igne trabes remisque paratis
> Pallada uelifero quaerentem bracchia malo.
> constitit ut longo moles non peruia ponto,
> puppis et ut tenues subiere latentia cerae
> lumina, picturae uarios super addit honores. (V. Fl. 1.121–129)

> There [Juno] sees all astir with the throng of men, and at the same moment the forest felled on every side and the shores ringing under the deft axe; already Thespian Argus is breaking apart pines with the thin saw, and the side is being joined and the planks are being softened into pliancy over a slow flame; the oars are ready, and Pallas is seeking a yard for the sail-bearing mast. When the ship stood firm in its huge bulk, impervious to long tracts of sea, and

[*] Thanks are due to Caroline Bishop, Lauren Ginsberg, Liz Gloyn, and Isabel Köster for their helpful comments on an early version of this paper. I would also like to thank Antony Augoustakis for organizing such a fantastic conference, and the other participants for their comments, contributions, and camaraderie.

[1] See, e.g., Murray (2005), who reads the apparent *praeteritio* as an actual polemic against earlier versions. Furthermore, recurring similes of ship-building (e.g., A. R. 1.1003–1010, 2.79–82) and allusions to the moment of construction (e.g., A. R. 1.526–527 and 721–724) suggest that the composition (and reading) of the epic progressively recreates the composition of the ship; this is not entirely dissimilar to the parallel that Valerius draws between the construction of the ship and the construction of the poem.

> when fine wax had filled the lurking holes, s/he[2] adds varied adornments of painting.

As Timothy Stover has recently argued, this passage overtly enacts Valerius' own poetic construction of the *Argonautica*.[3] Of course, metaphors of seafaring as poetry are traditional, reaching at least as far back as Hesiod;[4] what is new in Valerius' realization of the metaphor and in Stover's reading of it is the addition of what might be termed a Lucanean metaphor of destructive poetic deforestation, implying that earlier poetic versions of the Argo become the literal material, not just the literary material, used to build that poetic craft.[5] The timber that Argus has broken apart to build the Argo becomes the timber of previous instantiations of the Argo,[6] suggesting that destruction is an intrinsic part of Valerius' creative process,[7] especially since his work has already been fashioned by other craftsmen so many times in the past.

I find a disquieting echo of this construction later in book 1, when Valerius announces that Argus' task aboard the Argo is to keep her from splitting apart at the seams:

> Arge, tuae tibi cura ratis, te moenia doctum
> Thespia Palladio dant munere; sors tibi nequa
> parte trahat tacitum puppis mare fissaque fluctu
> uel pice uel molli conducere uulnera cera. (V. Fl. 1.477–480)

> To you, Argus, falls the care of your own vessel, you with the skill that Pallas has bestowed on you are the gift of the city of Thespiae; it is your lot to see that the ship on no side let in the stealthy water, and to seal with pitch or pliant wax the wounds cleft by the waves.

---

2 While Mozley takes Argus as the subject of *addit* (1.129), there is in fact no grammatical reason to be certain of this, and contextually, arguments could be made for Argus, Juno, or Minerva; cf. Zissos (2008) 154.

3 Stover (2010).

4 Rosen (1990).

5 This idea is strengthened when the personification of the Argo tells Jason that Juno has taken her from *fatidicis siluis* (V. Fl. 1.303). Not only does Valerius hint that the Argo's prophetic prow possibly came from multiple trees, *siluis*, rather than a single oak, but there is also a pun inherent in *siluis*, which can signify literary material (*OLD* s.v. *silua* 5b). This pun is implicit in the actual construction scene, which does not use the word *silua* (although it does use the equally metapoetic *nemus*, 1.122), and explicit here in the Argo's speech.

6 As Stover (2010) 645–646 points out, the word *dissoluere* (1.123) is unusual in its present context of breaking apart raw timber; *soluo* and its compounds are usually applied to the breaking apart of whole ships. Thus, Stover says, "it is as if previous instantiations of Argo must first be 'pulled apart' in order to yield the material to (re)build the ship anew" (646).

7 The idea in itself is not unique to Valerius (cf. Masters [1992] 25–29); what is unique is his application of this to the Argo, which in turn is a stand-in for the poem as a whole.

In assigning this task to Argus, Valerius suggests the inevitable pressures of disparate material that has been skillfully joined into a single craft, whether sea-going or poetic.[8] As a result, the Argo's potential for self-destruction and intestine discord is marked, and indeed, it is only a matter of time before she does begin to come apart, primarily under the influence of her own poetic predecessors.[9] At the same time, those predecessors suffer a similar fate of annihilation. It is this process of mutual poetic destruction and its suggestion of civil war that will concern me in what follows.

At the center of the poem, the Argo is repeatedly destroyed, literally and symbolically. Her literal destruction occurs as she passes through the Clashing Rocks (4.691–693), which crush the tip of her stern, and she is symbolically destroyed twice shortly thereafter. Once, she is visually immolated by the blazing funeral pyre of Tiphys and Idmon (5.33–34),[10] and once, as I shall argue, she is metaphorically slain in the form of the bird that feeds on Prometheus' liver (5.175–176). While all three scenes are highly pertinent for questions of metapoetics, the first and last are especially relevant to the peculiarly destructive aspect of Valerius' engagement with his Greek predecessors.[11] Two predecessors in particular are implicated: one of them,

---

8 Valerius had mentioned the pressures of the sea previously (1.127), but there he had claimed that the ship was *non peruia ponto*, whereas here he admits the possibility of fissure. As Stover (2010) 646 observes, "the ship must be able to withstand the rigors of the 'ocean of epic,'" but whether or not it *is* able to do so comes under increasing doubt as the epic progresses. On the sea and seafaring as images suggestive of epic poetry specifically, see recently Harrison (2007).

9 The first time she cracks open is during the highly Virgilian storm at 1.609–642.

10 The Argo herself appears to *be* the funeral pyre, in fact, perishing together with her dead crewmen: *tunc ipsa cremari / uisa ratis medioque uiros deponere ponto* ("then it seemed as though the ship herself were burning and sinking the heroes in mid-sea," V. Fl. 5.33–34).

11 It is Tiphys' death, rather than the metaphorical destruction of the Argo, that is the focal point of the multi-level metapoetic crisis that occupies and extends from the central scene (although see n. 28). On the deaths of Tiphys and Idmon, see Van der Schuur's essay in this volume, pp. 95–112, as well as Krasne (2011) 136–139, where I discuss the metapoetics of the scene with a particular view to Valerius' debt to the *Aeneid*. In addition, I would briefly point out here (and develop in Krasne [forthcoming]) that a unique run of *aetia* drawn directly from Apollonius occurs in this central region, primarily stemming from Tiphys' death, when the loss of the ship's (and poet's) Aratean guide deprives the ship of an ability to follow the astronomical σήματα (constellations) and instead forces the poet to follow the terrestrial σήματα laid down by Apollonius' *aetia*. Put another way, Tiphys' presence allows Valerius to innovate on an aetiological level (not one of the twenty *aetia* that occur in the first half of the epic derives from Apollonius), while his absence reduces Valerius to reiterating the frequently-travelled Argonautic itinerary and the signposts left by both Argonauts and Argonautic authors. (This summary is necessarily overly simplified and hence slightly inaccurate, but it gives the correct impression.) See Volk (2012) on Aratean σήματα and Barnes (2003) on Apollonian σήματα.

unsurprisingly, is Apollonius' *Argonautica*; the other is the celestial Argo of Aratus' *Phaenomena*.[12]

The Argo is fated to be catasterized. Valerius says as much in the proem (*flammifero tandem consedit Olympo*, "sank at last to rest in the starry firmament," V. Fl. 1.4), and Juno apparently promised catasterism to the Argo's prophetic oak in order to win acquiescence for its inclusion in the ship (*nec fatidicis auellere siluis / me nisi promisso potuit Saturnia caelo*, "the Saturnian goddess could not have torn me from the prophetic woods had not heaven been promised to me," V. Fl. 1.303–304). And it is, or so Valerius tells us, the Argo's passage through the Clashing Rocks that defines her "ultimate celestial form," as Andrew Zissos terms it.[13] But here we encounter a problem. Valerius is very explicit that, while the Clashing Rocks clip off the Argo's stern-ornaments, it is the *rest* of the ship—namely, her intact portion—that is destined for heaven:

> saxa sed extremis tamen increpuere corymbis
> parsque (nefas) deprensa iugis, *nam cetera caelo*
> *debita.* (V. Fl. 4.691–693)

> Yet the rocks crashed upon the tip of the stern-ornaments, and part (oh horror!) was caught by the crags: *the rest was owed to heaven.*

Cetera [*pars*] refers to the part that has not already been mentioned, namely, the part that is not crushed by the Rocks.[14] This is unique in discussions of the Argo's catasterism, from Aratus onward. While the constellation of the Argo is most assuredly only a half-ship, traditionally it is her *rear* half that is catasterized, namely the part that is crushed between the Clashing Rocks. The fact that the Argo's stern is the visible half is a point made explicitly by both Aratus and his surviving Latin translators:[15]

> ἡ δὲ Κυνὸς μεγάλοιο κατ' οὐρὴν ἕλκεται Ἀργὼ
> πρυμνόθεν· οὐ γὰρ τῇ γε κατὰ χρέος εἰσὶ κέλευθοι,

---

[12] On the broader engagement of Valerius with Aratus, particularly Aratus and acrostics, see Castelletti in this volume, pp. 49–72.

[13] Zissos (2004b) 327.

[14] *TLL* 3.965.45–65 provides a variety of sources which elucidate various shades of meaning in *ceterus*; in no instance does it seem to mean the same portion which has already been specified. Cf. *OLD* s.v. *ceterus* 1: "the rest of, the remaining part of, the other."

[15] In Aratus' Latin translators, the equivalent passages are Cic. *Arat.* 126–138 and Germ. *Arat.* 344–355. Similarly, Pseudo-Eratosthenes (*Cat.* 1.35) and Hyginus (*Astr.* 2.37) also describe the constellation as only the stern of the ship. Many thanks are due to Joseph Farrell for kindly sending me a copy of his unpublished conference paper on Argonautic constellations in Roman poetry (cited here as Farrell [2010]).

ἀλλ' ὄπιθεν φέρεται τετραμμένη, οἷα καὶ αὐταὶ
νῆες, ὅτ' ἤδη ναῦται ἐπιστρέψωσι κορώνην
ὅρμον ἐσερχόμενοι· τὴν δ' αὐτίκα πᾶς ἀνακόπτει
νῆα, παλιρροθίη δὲ καθάπτεται ἠπείροιο·
ὣς ἥ γε πρύμνηθεν Ἰησονὶς ἕλκεται Ἀργώ.
καὶ τὰ μὲν ἠερίη καὶ ἀνάστερος ἄχρι παρ' αὐτὸν
ἱστὸν ἀπὸ πρώρης φέρεται, τὰ δὲ πᾶσα φαεινή·
καί οἱ πηδάλιον κεχαλασμένον ἐστήρικται
ποσσὶν ὑπ' οὐραίοισι Κυνὸς προπάροιθεν ἰόντος. (Arat. *Phaen.* 342–352)

Close to the great Dog's tail is *Argo towed stern first*. Its course is not that of a ship proceeding on its normal business, but its movement is backward-turned, like that of real ships when the sailors have already turned the stern about on entering harbor: all of the crew quickly back water, and the ship surging astern makes fast to the land. So this Argo of Jason is towed stern first. *Dark and starless from the prow as far as the actual mast she goes, but the rest is all bright.* The steering-oar is detached and set fast under the Dog's hind legs as it runs ahead.

They all describe how she moves in reverse, unlike a normal ship, and how she only is bright with stars from the tip of her poop-deck up to the mast; beyond that, she is invisible. Germanicus goes so far as to mention the Argo's encounter with the Clashing Rocks as the cause for her celestial half-shape:

sed quae[16] pars uiolata fuit, coeuntia saxa
numine Iunonis tutus cum fugit Iason,
haec micat in caelo. (Germ. *Arat.* 350–352)

But the part which was destroyed when Jason, by Juno's divinity, safely fled the Clashing Rocks—this glitters in the sky.

The half that has been physically lost is, according to Germanicus, placed into the heavens as a memorial.[17] Not so, clearly, for Valerius; why the change, and what does it signify?[18]

---

16 Gain adopts the reading *quia*, found in the O-family of manuscripts, against *quae*, the reading of the Z-family.

17 Gain (1976) 100 thinks that this is impossible because it would mean that the entire back half of the Argo was crushed between the Rocks, rather than just its tip, and therefore he advocates the alternative reading *quia* instead of *quae* (350). This would imply, however, that the whole reason for the Argo's catasterism was the fact that she was damaged by the Clashing Rocks, which seems to me even less reasonable than simply allowing for hyperbole (hyperbole which, I might observe, finds a parallel in Valerius' claim at 4.693 that the *entire* remainder of the ship will be catasterized).

18 Sens (1994) 70–72 observes a somewhat similar reworking of Apollonius (and, perhaps, Aratus) in Theocritus 22, where (among other "corrections") a μέγα κῦμα comes rolling down on the prow rather than the stern. It may also be worth observing that the Argo turns, of her

I propose that what we have here is an explicit rejection of the Aratean model.[19] We recall that Valerius had metaphorically woven previous versions of the Argo into the ship's fabric during the scene of her construction in book 1. Here, he begins forcibly to remove these earlier versions, and his first victim is the half-ship of Aratus. On the one hand, it is naturally Valerius' own Argo that is actually damaged here by the Clashing Rocks.[20] However, what appears to be eradicated from the text at this point is the Aratean Argo, namely the rear portion of the Argo. This allusion to Aratus' Argo is underscored by Valerius' choice of words. He observes that the ship loses her *extremis … corymbis* ("the tip of her stern-ornaments," V. Fl. 4.691), which translates a phrase used by Aratus in his second mention of the Argo (*Phaen.* 686): Aratus says that the Argo's ἄκρα κόρυμβα disappear as she begins to descend below the horizon at the rising of Capricorn.

The word *corymbus* is common, in Latin, but Valerius' use of it constitutes a terminological innovation. He is the first and only attested Latin author to use *corymbus* for a ship's stern-ornaments, rather than for clusters of actual vegetation.[21] Valerius' use of the word in this sense is not limited to this passage, however, and his other uses of *corymbus* strengthen the Aratean reference and rejection. In book 1, Jason and his men vow that *auratis Argo reditura corymbis* ("the Argo will return with gilded stern-ornaments," V. Fl. 1.272–273); while they naturally turn out to be wrong, an Aratean reader, encountering the word in its new Latin usage, might well think of the glittering celestial κόρυμβα of Aratus' Argo that will be enshrined in the sky. In book 8, the Argonaut Erginus closely echoes the earlier phrasing when he points out to Jason that they *cannot*, in fact, survive a second trip through the Clashing Rocks (*non totis Argo redit ecce corymbis*, "the Argo returns not with

---

own volition, once she has entered the stream of the Phasis, in a self-propelled recollection of the Aratean sailors' turning of the prow (V. Fl. 5.210–212). Finally, it is possible that Valerius has picked up on a phrase in Seneca's *Medea*, where Medea claims that *Argo reuersa* (*Med.* 238) is the only possible source of reproach against her. While Medea simply means the return voyage, Farrell (2010) also draws a connection between the phrase and the astronomical tradition of a backwards-sailing Argo; in the topsy-turvy world of Valerius' epic, however, the already-inverted constellation has itself become reversed.

19 On the most basic level of internal consistency, we could say that the surviving half, i.e., the front half, has to be catasterized in order that Juno can fulfill her promise of catasterism for the speaking prow of the ship. Of course, it was Valerius who set things up this way in the first place, so this is not in fact an answer.

20 Indeed, the Argonauts believe she has literally split in two, her sides seeming to spring apart and consign them all to a watery grave (V. Fl. 4.693–694).

21 *TLL* 4.1081.68–70.

stern-ornaments unharmed," V. Fl. 8.194).[22] These three uses of *corymbus*, the only three in Valerius, set up an expectation and rejection of the ship's celestial shape as defined by Aratus. The allusion may be mediated through Apollonius, who provides a more immediate model for the phrase *ἄκρα κόρυμβα* in the Clashing Rocks episode (ἔμπης δ' ἀφλάστοιο παρέθρισαν *ἄκρα κόρυμβα* / νωλεμὲς ἐμπλήξασαι ἐναντίαι, "but all the same the rocks sheared off *the very tip of the stern-ornament* when they dashed firmly together," A. R. 2.601–602), but Aratus' own passage ultimately lies behind Apollonius' use of the term as well;[23] and Valerius' reference to the Argo's catasterism in the following lines (V. Fl. 4.692–693) underscores the Aratean reference.

In short, the half of the Argo which shines for Aratus is simply removed from Valerius' world. It does not continue further on the journey, being lost to the Clashing Rocks, and it *also* will not shine in the heavens. This is not to say that Aratean influence on Valerius ends here—it does not. Rather than being a literal death, the removal of Aratus' Argo is the overtly enacted and performative destruction of a textual mirror of Valerius' Argo, one of those many disparate sources that comprise the craft. I shall soon argue that this violence, in essence intended to eradicate an alternate self and even reduce it to a state of non-existence, serves as a manifestation of the civil discord that pervades the poem.[24] First, however, I want to consider how the same sort of destruction also afflicts Apollonius' Argo, whose "death," I propose, we witness a little further on, at the very close of the *periplus* section.

In Apollonius' *Argonautica*, immediately prior to their arrival in Colchis, the Argonauts sail past the site of Prometheus' torments and hear his

---

22 See Barich (1982) 104–105 and Zissos (2008) 213, who observe the repetition but do not draw a connection with Aratus' Argo.

23 Both Hellenistic authors draw on Homer *Il.* 9.241 (στεῦται γὰρ *νηῶν ἀποκόψειν ἄκρα κόρυμβα*, "for he threatens to chop off the tip of the ships' stern-ornaments"). It is possible that Valerius' choice of *corymbis* is only influenced by Apollonius' passage, rather than Aratus' as well, but it seems unlikely to me that he would adopt the unusual term in that case—why so specific an allusion to what is already his expected model? Germanicus' choice of *aplustria* (345) is certainly *not* influenced by Aratus, who nowhere uses ἄφλαστον, but it may be influenced by the same line (2.601) of Apollonius, in a reversal of what I argue is Valerius' gesture. If so, this would be an interesting case of *contaminatio*. That said, Germanicus uses *aplustria* [*Puppis*] on several other occasions (489, 620, 684), and it is the normal Latin word for the carved stern, so this is more probably his regular terminology.

24 Seal discusses several major manifestations of this pervasive civil discord, in particular the fraternal civil war in Colchis, as well as the literary background to the conceit, in his essay in this volume, pp. 113–135. See also Stover (2012) and Bernstein (forthcoming) for recent readings of the contemporary relevance of Valerius' heightened engagement with civil war.

anguished cries from a distance; they also see the liver-consuming eagle fly overhead:

> τὸν μὲν ἐπ᾽ ἀκροτάτης ἴδον ἕσπερον ὀξέι ῥοίζῳ
> νηὸς ὑπερπτάμενον νεφέων σχεδόν· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔμπης
> λαίφεα πάντ᾽ ἐτίναξε παραιθύξας πτερύγεσσιν·
> οὐ γὰρ ὅ γ᾽ αἰθερίοιο φυὴν ἔχεν οἰωνοῖο,
> ἶσα δ᾽ ἐυξέστοις ὠκύπτερα πάλλεν ἐρετμοῖς. (A. R. 2.1251–1255)

> They saw it at dusk flying with a sharp whirr above the top of the ship near the clouds, but nonetheless it made all the sails flap as it darted past on its wings, for it did not have the form of a bird of the air but plied its long wing-feathers like well-polished oars.

While transferred metaphors of rowing for flying and flying for sailing are not uncommon in ancient literature,[25] Apollonius' eagle is remarkably ship-like: its wings are not simply *like* oars, but they are *equal*, ἶσα, to oars. It even appears to the Argonauts that the eagle is not a bird at all, suggesting (given its ship-like appearance) that it might be more akin to their own vessel; and indeed, the eagle in Apollonius has long been recognized as a parallel for the Argo, from antiquity onwards.[26] Given this parallelism, the bird's fate in Valerius' *Argonautica* is disturbing.

Valerius' Argonauts pass by Prometheus somewhat later in the Titan's history of prolonged punishment,[27] in fact arriving on the scene just as it is reaching an end:

> contra autem ignari (quis enim nunc credat in illis
> montibus Alciden dimissaue uota retemptet?)
> pergere iter socii. tantum mirantur ab alto
> litora discussa sterni niue ruptaque saxa
> et simul ingentem moribundae desuper umbram
> alitis atque atris rorantes imbribus auras. (V. Fl. 5.171–176)

> But in their ignorance (for who could have believed that Alcides was on those hills, or ventured once more on hopes abandoned?) his companions proceed upon their way; only they wonder from the deep at the wide-flung snow that strews the beaches, at the cloven crags and the huge shadow of a dying bird above them and the gory dew that drizzles through the air.

---

[25] Gow (1917) 117 collects a number of passages.

[26] Gow (1938) 14 has argued that authors as early as Theocritus picked up on this symbolism, since Theocritus' Argo inversely enters the bay of Colchis αἰετὸς ὥς (*Id.* 13.24), "like an eagle." See also Byre (2002) 52–53 and Newman (1986) 82.

[27] Caroline Bishop points out to me that this belated arrival of Valerius' crew is rather appropriate for a poet of his self-consciously belated generation!

Rather than seeing the ship-like bird as it flies overhead, they see the bird's huge shadow as it dies overhead, slain by their erstwhile shipmate Hercules. This is, effectively, the death of what might be considered a veritable incarnation of Apollonius' Argo, at the hands of a former member of the Argo's own crew.[28] Again, repeating his earlier eradication of Aratus' Argo, Valerius here enacts the destruction of yet another textual mirror.

Moreover, just as Valerius has rejected Aratus' particular version of the Argo by reversing her catasterism and literally annihilating her surviving traces within the epic, in a way he also rejects Apollonius' specific avian embodiment of the Argo, beyond simply effecting the bird's destruction. For Apollonius, the bird is Zeus' eagle, a manifestation of the punishment that he inflicts on Prometheus, and therefore it is parallel in this way, too, to the Argo, in that they both enact Zeus' will.[29] Valerius, by contrast, makes the bird a vulture (4.69 and 7.359): no longer intimately connected with Zeus, the bird now evokes a new set of associations for Valerius' Roman audience. Such a heightening of Roman ideas and themes is not uncommon in Valerius' epic,[30] but what is its effect in this instance?

First and foremost, vultures were popular in the Roman imagination because they were the birds espied by Romulus and Remus in their augury contest. As a result, according to Plutarch, vultures were a popular bird of augury for the Romans (Plut. *Rom.* 9.5, *Mor.* 286A). But Plutarch also tells us something else about vultures, which is that they were a bird of good omen in general, and particularly for Heracles (*Rom.* 9.6, *Mor.* 286B–C). Therefore, Hercules is here destroying his own favored bird. I would argue that, through the replacement of Zeus' eagle with the vulture of Romulus and Hercules, Valerius is evoking the specter of fratricide in a variety of ways. The simple replacement of eagle with vulture might, even on its own, be imagined to draw in the fratricidal themes of Romulus and Remus' augury contest. Hercules' murder of his own propitious bird strengthens this

---

28 In addition to the resonances of fratricide and civil war in this scene, there is another, highly poetic reason for Valerius to effect the bird's death here. The death of Apollonius' avian poem incarnate comes as a violent reaction to the intensified Apollonian narrative that has preceded this scene (an unprecedented retention of Apollonius' entire run of *aetia* in the final pre-Colchis *periplus* section), following the death of Tiphys that left Valerius' poetic craft seemingly rudderless (despite the Argo's own appointment of Erginus to fill the vacant position). See my further comments in n. 11 above.

29 Byre (2002) 52–53.

30 See, e.g., Boyle and Sullivan (1991) 272–275 and Zissos (2005) 511–513.

intimation of kindred destruction. To find a suggestion of fratricide in Valerius' *Argonautica* is anything but surprising: as I have mentioned, fratricide and civil war, which are parallel crimes in the Roman imagination,[31] are themes that pervade Valerius' epic, especially its second half,[32] and are also repeatedly visible in all three central scenes of the Argo's destruction.[33]

If we return to the first scene of the Argo's destruction, when she loses her stern to the Clashing Rocks, we find a particularly strong manifestation of these themes. To begin with, the Clashing Rocks themselves are a locus of civil war, or fratricide. The fraternal strife inherent in the Clashing Rocks' perpetual motion is most clearly expressed by the blind prophet Phineus, who describes the Rocks' constant strife in terms that strongly suggest civil war:

> *furor* his medio concurrere ponto;
> necdum ullas uidere rates: *sua* comminus actae
> saxa premunt cautesque *suas*. ceu uincula mundi
> ima labant, tremere ecce solum, tremere ipsa repente
> tecta uides: illae redeunt, illae aequore certant. (V. Fl. 4.562–566)

> Their *madness* is to clash together in mid-sea, nor yet have they seen any ships; they crush *their own* cliffs, *their own* boulders when they meet. As though the deepest fastenings of the world are shaken, lo! the ground trembles, the very firmament quakes before your sight; once more they return and fight upon the sea.

They are driven by *furor*, a word which Lucan had irrevocably associated with the crime of internecine strife.[34] In addition, the words *sua* and *suas* in Phineus' description highlight the civil war undertones: these are not unrelated enemies that are clashing together, but a matched pair of twins. When the Rocks actually crush the Argo's stern, Valerius' apostrophic exclamation

---

31 Green (1994) 205: "Fratricide and civil war were the private and public faces of the same crime." Bannon (1997) 10: "Fratricide becomes the ultimate metaphor for the public and personal conflicts generated by civil strife."

32 See n. 24 above.

33 Masters (1992) has argued that Lucan, an intensively important model for Valerius, had created the notion of a text at war with itself, a text that enacts the civil war which it narrates. Here, that textual self-aggression is directed not so much inwardly as at earlier instantiations of the text, which nonetheless comprise the text. The Argo, constructed of disparate sources just as the *Argonautica* itself is, always possesses within itself the possibility of dissolution; here, at the poem's very core, is where that dissolution actually occurs.

34 Lapidge (1979). The Rocks' concussions even threaten a cosmic dissolution of Stoic proportions, as Valerius makes clear with *uincula mundi / ima labant* (4.564–565)—*uincula mundi* is Stoic cosmological terminology, according to Lapidge (1979) 350.

of *nefas* (4.692) further evokes the notion of civil war, the word and idea having become firmly yoked together in poetry by the Flavian period.[35]

In the context of Valerius' Greek predecessors and their interaction with the Argo, the Rocks' fratricide stems not just from their perpetual self-aggression, but also from the way in which the similes that Valerius uses to describe them allude to earlier versions of the *Argonautica*, specifically the same versions that he will shortly endeavor to destroy. The violence of civil war is always mutual: every action is its own equal and opposite reaction. Accordingly, their destruction of the Argo turns out to be no different than their normal self-aggression—it is simply violence against a different sort of twin. Just as Valerius is eradicating earlier models of the Argo, so earlier versions of the *Argonautica* destroy his own ship.

In what ways do the Rocks recall Valerius' predecessors? One answer comes at the beginning of the episode, as the Argonauts first approach the Rocks. Valerius tells us that they do not appear to be rocks, but rather a fallen piece of the starry pole:

stant ora metu nec fessa recedunt
lumina diuersas circum seruantibus undas,
cum procul auditi sonitus insanaque saxa,
saxa neque illa uiris, sed praecipitata profundo
siderei pars uisa poli. (V. Fl. 4.639–643)

Their faces are stark with fear, nor do their weary eyes give over their watching of the waters on every side, when from afar are heard the sounds of the raging rocks, yet not rocks seemed they to the heroes, but *a part of the starry pole* plunged into the deep.

I propose that the image of a chunk of starry sky is meant to put Valerius' reader in mind of Aratus' *Phaenomena*. Not only does this allusion, placed at the very beginning of the Clashing Rocks episode, ultimately find a response in the allusion to the Argo's catasterism that brings the episode to a close, but the specific term *polus* even recalls Aratus' opening discussion of the twin heavenly poles:

καί μιν πειραίνουσι δύω πόλοι ἀμφοτέρωθεν·
ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν οὐκ ἐπίοπτος, ὁ δ' ἀντίος ἐκ βορέαο
ὑψόθεν ὠκεανοῖο. (Arat. *Phaen.* 24–26)

Two poles terminate [the axle] at the two ends; but one is not visible, while the opposite one in the north is high above the ocean.

---

35 The connection between *nefas* and civil war is mobilized by the Augustan poets, firmly established by Lucan, and maintained by the Flavian poets. See McGuire (1997) xi, 144–156; Ganiban (2007) 33–38.

Possibly, the allusion points more directly to Germanicus' version than to Aratus' own, if the idea of the pole being submerged in the depths is meant to suggest his *pars mersa sub undas*:

> extremum geminus determinat axem
> quem Grai dixere polon: *pars mersa sub undas*
> Oceani, pars celsa sub horrifero Aquilone. (Germ. *Arat.* 21–23)
>
> A twin caps the axle's end, which the Greeks call a "pole": *part is submerged beneath the waves* of Ocean, part is on high, beneath dreadful Aquilo.

As the ship partially incorporates the Aratean Argo, so the rocks embody the poem in which that Argo appears.[36]

The similes that link Apollonius' *Argonautica* to the Rocks function somewhat differently. They do not recall the poem as a whole, but rather allude to a particular episode that triangulates with Valerius' own *Argonautica*; specifically, to Jason's yoking of Aeetes' bulls. Apollonius, in his Clashing Rocks episode, had Athena swat the Argo through the Rocks with her hand (A. R. 2.598–600). Valerius instead has Juno and Minerva alight on either side of the Bosporus and jointly strain to keep the Rocks from crashing together on the ship; their effort to hold back the pair of rocks is compared with someone's struggle to subdue unwilling bulls to the yoke:

> hic ⟨Iuno⟩ praecepsque ex aethere Pallas
> insiliunt pariter scopulos: hunc nata coercet,
> hunc coniunx Iouis, *ut ualido qui robore tauros*
> *sub iuga et inuito detorquet in ilia cornu*.
> inde, uelut mixtis Vulcanius ardor harenis
> uerset aquas, sic ima fremunt fluctuque coacto
> angitur et clausum scopulos super effluit aequor. (V. Fl. 4.682–688)
>
> Hereupon Juno and Pallas leap sheer down from the sky upon the rocks; this one the daughter of Jove, that one his spouse constrains, *even as one who with brawny strength thrusts down beneath the yoke toward their bellies the unwilling horns of bulls*. Then, as though Vulcan's heat were churning water and sand together, even so the depths roar, and choked with close-pressed waves the imprisoned sea pours in flood over the rocks.

This simile alone would evoke the bulls of Jason's future trials for a knowing Argonautic reader, although the image is closer to Valerius' own version of Jason's trials than to Apollonius' version.[37] However, Apollonius' version is

[36] In addition, the Rocks' massive size suggest, in metaliterary fashion, another epic. For massifs as epics, see, e.g., Masters (1992) and Stover (2010).

[37] Gärtner (1994) gives only Ov. *Her.* 6.97 as an antecedent for the simile.

drawn in more strongly through a second simile that follows immediately on the heels of the first. As the goddesses hold back the rocks, Valerius likens the roiling sea to a roaring blast of Vulcan's fire, *Vulcanius ardor*, suggesting the heat of Vulcan's forge and, in the wake of the bull simile, also recalling a simile that Apollonius had used of Aeetes' bulls, comparing their fiery breath to the blasts of a forge:

> ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἐνὶ τρητοῖσιν ἐΰρρινοι χοάνοισιν
> φῦσαι χαλκήων ὁτὲ μέν τ' ἀναμαρμαίρουσιν
> πῦρ ὀλοὸν πιμπρᾶσαι, ὅτ' αὖ λήγουσιν ἀυτμῆς,
> δεινὸς δ' ἐξ αὐτοῦ πέλεται βρόμος, ὁππότ' ἀίξῃ
> νειόθεν· ὣς ἄρα τώ γε θοὴν φλόγα φυσιόωντες
> ἐκ στομάτων ὁμάδευν ... (A. R. 3.1299–1304)

> And as when through the holes of a furnace strong leather bellows of bronzesmiths at times cause ravening fire to burn and blaze up, but then, when they cease their blowing, a terrible roar arises from the fire when it springs up from below—thus indeed the two oxen made a din as they bellowed the darting flame from their mouths ...

Particular resonance comes from the correspondence between *ima fremunt* in Valerius' text and βρόμος ... νειόθεν in Apollonius'.

Valerius' overall description of the Rocks, especially with this second simile of *Vulcanius ardor*, activates yet another Apollonian intertext. The Clashing Rocks are often confused or conflated in the Argonautic tradition with the Wandering Rocks, the Planktai, and Valerius has, accordingly, appropriated Apollonius' Planktai into his description of the Clashing Rocks:

> ἄλλοθι δὲ Πλαγκταὶ μεγάλῳ ὑπὸ κύματι πέτραι
> ῥόχθεον, ᾗχι πάροιθεν *ἀπέπτυεν αἰθομένη φλὸξ*
> *ἄκρων ἐκ σκοπέλων* πυριθαλπέος ὑψόθι πέτρης,
> *καπνῷ δ' ἀχλυόεις αἰθὴρ πέλεν* οὐδέ κεν αὐγὰς
> ἔδρακες ἠελίοιο. τότ' αὖ *λήξαντος ἀπ' ἔργων*
> *Ἡφαίστου θερμὴν ἔτι κήκιε πόντος ἀυτμήν*. (A. R. 4.924–929)

> Elsewhere the Wandering Rocks were thundering under the mighty swell, where previously *blazing flame had spurted out from the peaks* above the rock heated by the fire, *and the air was clouded with smoke*, nor could you have seen the rays of the sun. At this time, *although Hephaestus had stopped working, the sea was still bubbling out hot steam.*

> bis fragor infestas cautes aduersaque saxis
> saxa dedit, *flamma expresso bis fulsit in imbri* ...
> ... praecepsque fragores
> per medios ruit et *fumo se condidit atro* ...
> inde, uelut mixtis *Vulcanius ardor* harenis
> *uerset aquas* ... (V. Fl. 4.659–660, 675–676, 686–687)

> Twice crashed together cliff with cliff and rock with rock, *twice shone the flame in the upward-flung spray* … and he speeds headlong through the midst of the uproar and *plunges into the murky smoke* … Then as though *Vulcan's heat were churning water* and sand together …

The mention of the flame that shoots up when they crash together is a notable component of this transference, as is the smoky air, but the simile of Vulcan's heat churning the water furthers the allusion by recalling the boiling sea around the Planktai, where Apollonius locates Hephaestus' forge. While part of Valerius' purpose may be to assert the conflation of the Symplegades and the Planktai, another result is to associate the Rocks even more strongly with Apollonius' epic.

Thus, as with the Rocks' incorporation of Aratus' *Phaenomena*, aspects of Apollonius' *Argonautica* are in some ways embodied by the Rocks, especially via a network of similes. However, beyond the simple suggestion of Valerius' predecessors as both destroyers and destroyed in this section, the simile of the bulls draws our attention to another aspect of the similarity and self-destruction that are contained within this episode. In this case, the theme is, in fact, activated through a pun. Valerius uses the word *iugum* four times in the Clashing Rocks episode, leveraging three different meanings of the word—yoke, ridge, and rowing-bench—and thereby linking Rocks with bulls *and* with the Argo herself. The distribution of the words seems to emphasize that the resonances are intentional: Jason leaps over the Argo's *iuga* (4.647) as his crew first balks at the looming star-like Rocks, followed ten lines later by a reference to the Clashing Rocks as *iuga* (4.658); and Valerius' use of *iuga* (4.685) to refer to the bulls' yokes in the simile is followed just seven lines later by the very moment of the Argo's destruction, as her tip is caught by the Clashing Rocks, again described as *iuga* (4.692).[38] The effect is, again, to strengthen the identification between ship, Rocks, and (by extension) poetic predecessor—that is, between destroyer and destroyed.

What, then, is the result of this intertextual and intratextual web of identity, similarity, and self-destruction? I have already mentioned the theme of civil war and fratricide. By proactively destroying earlier versions of the Argo and *Argonautica*, versions which are themselves incorporated into the

---

38 *Iuga* is also the term used for the Clashing Rocks in the proem (V. Fl. 1.3). Other terms used for the Clashing Rocks in this section are *rupes* (637), *saxa* (641), *montes* (645), *cautes* (659), and *scopulis* (668), several times each. Murgatroyd (2009) 330 observes that while Wagner and Langen wanted *iugis* at 4.692 to refer to the Argo's thwarts, "the grammar is then difficult."

Rocks that destroy his own Argo, Valerius is enacting the mutual identical destruction of civil war which will be so forcibly presented in the second half of his poem. However, even the promotion of this theme is not an end in and of itself; rather, it is a means to an end.[39] That end, I think, is the casting of an intensely negative light on even the most positive of elements in the poem, namely the Argo's own catasterism. Catasterism is generally a strongly positive event, frequently equated with immortality or even apotheosis, and Valerius appears to promote this positive reading of catasterism in his epic's proem, both for the Argo herself and for Vespasian (1.1–4 and 16–21, respectively).[40] Even though Valerius alludes there to the traditional idea that the Argo's *audacia* and her opening of the seas bring about the end of the Golden Age,[41] there is no hint of negativity to the catasterism itself. That all changes here, in the center of the poem.

We recall that, unlike the Aratean Argo, for Valerius it is the Argo's surviving half which is deified. That half will return to Greece irremediably sullied by the Argo's exposure to civil war, not only in Colchis, where an actual civil war rages, but also in this central section, where the Argo has repeatedly witnessed and been involved in the destruction of a variety of Argo-incarnations: herself, Aratus' Argo, and Apollonius' Argo.[42] Her encounter with the Clashing Rocks, which embody civil war, is partially responsible for the Argo's embroilment in so negative a theme, but the Rocks' reflection of those same Argonautic predecessors, enacting destruction upon the Argo herself, suggests that perhaps civil war is a part of the Argo's own nature. And, in fact, as I have mentioned, this is true: the potential for civil war and fratricide is inherent in her construction. The disparate elements of her composition are at odds with each other, a constant struggle illustrated by an early encounter in book 1 with a highly Virgilian storm which causes the

39 This is by contrast with Valerius' model for the textual enactment of civil war, namely Lucan, whose entire purpose was for the *Civil War* text to be at war with itself in as many ways as possible (Masters [1992]).

40 Mitousi's contribution to this volume reflects on the connotations of Vespasian's catasterism, pp. 153–168.

41 Davis (1989). On the Argonauts' voyage as the end of the Golden Age and / or beginning of the Iron Age, see (among others) Fabre-Serris (2008) and Feeney (2007) 118–136; on further interpretations of the Argonauts' *audacia* in Valerius Flaccus, see Landrey (2012) and (forthcoming).

42 McGuire (1997) 92 suggested that Discordia would be "a worthy bowsprit" for the Argo, who drags conflict in her wake as she travels eastward; Seal, in this volume (p. 130), also rightly observes the internecine conflict that the Argo brings with her on her return, in particular the fated murder of Pelias at the hands of those closest to him.

vessel's explicit, if temporary, dissolution (*alnus / soluitur*, V. Fl. 1.637–638).[43] Such a dissolution of the Argo strictly cannot happen for Apollonius, whose divinely-built craft holds fast under all pressures (A. R. 3.340–344). Valerius, however, proclaims that Argus' task is to keep this poetic craft intact, and the need for his attention is clear, especially as the ship is fated *not* to survive the journey intact. By the time she reaches the stars, she *will* be a half-ship; the only question is how this will come about. For Valerius, although not for all Argonautic authors,[44] she will lose a part of herself as she passes through the Clashing Rocks, burst by them just as she bursts through them, a rupture which no amount of pitch or wax can mend. Argus, and by extension the poet he stands for, has failed to protect the ship from herself and from her predecessors. As the ship embodies the poem, so she embodies the poem's civil war. But beyond that, Valerius uses the Argo's destruction to alter the stars themselves,[45] by means of his inverted catasterism. Civil war, it seems, is a fate that, in Valerius' universe, will be written in the stars.

43 Lóio observes, in her contribution to this volume (pp. 388–390), a probable epigrammatic use of the tall and imposing alder tree to represent epic, a sense which is possibly operative in this passage as well. Here, the (briefly homogeneous) alderwood poem-ship is temporarily fragmented by the pressures of another epic (i.e., the storm of Virgil's *Aeneid*) that hammers at her seams. The inevitable fragmentation of the ship is picked up on by Martial (7.19), who provides us with nothing except a single *fragmentum* of the Argo, which has succumbed to the depredations of time (on the poetics of this epigram, see Zissos [2004a]). There may also be an ironic interplay here with the poetic *topos* of alder-wood as particularly well-suited to sea-travel (cf. Virg. *G.* 1.136, Luc. 3.441, Stat. *Theb.* 6.106).

44 Theoc. *Id.* 13.22–23 has the Argo emerge unscathed from the Clashing Rocks.

45 The disarray of celestial bodies is a typical illustration of a disordered world; we see this, for instance, in Seneca's *Medea* when Medea imposes chaos on the stars themselves (*Med.* 757–759; cf. the contrasting expression of natural order at *Med.* 401–405), or even more strikingly in Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* when Typhoeus threatens the proper workings of the cosmos by literally manhandling the constellations and other celestial bodies out of their proper positions (*Dion.* 1.165–218).

ARATUS AND THE ARATEAN TRADITION IN VALERIUS' *ARGONAUTICA*[*]

Cristiano Castelletti

Aratus is an important model for Valerius, not only for astronomical references and allusions, but also for the Flavian poet's use of acrostics. This essay discusses the influence of Aratus' *Phaenomena* on the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus, by focusing on this last aspect.[1] Against older views, several recent studies have demonstrated that, in the wake of Aratus, Augustan and post-Augustan Latin poets use acrostics widely.[2] While there is a certain element of coincidence, objective criteria exist to help verify that these regular occurrences are intentional: a) the relation between the acrostics and the content of the passage in which they appear; b) various signposting techniques devised by the author; and c) intertextual references that embed the acrostics within the literary tradition. A number of examples found in Valerius Flaccus fulfill these criteria, and collectively they suggest that Valerius considers himself a continuator of a tradition set by his predecessors.

Before we proceed with the analysis of the passages in the *Argonautica*, let us review a few important acrostics elsewhere:

> *σκέπτεο δὲ πρῶτον κεράων* ἑκάτερθε σελήνην.
> ἄλλοτε γάρ τ' ἄλλῃ μιν ἐπιγράφει ἕσπερος αἴγλῃ,
> ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοῖαι μορφαὶ κερόωσι σελήνην
> εὐθὺς ἀεξομένην, αἱ μὲν τρίτῃ, αἱ δὲ τετάρτῃ·
> τάων καὶ περὶ μηνὸς ἐφεσταότος κε πύθοιο.
> **λεπτὴ** μὲν καθαρή τε περὶ τρίτον ἦμαρ ἐοῦσα
> εὔδιός κ' εἴη, **λεπτὴ** δὲ καὶ εὖ μάλ' ἐρευθὴς
> **π**νευματίη, **π**αχίων δὲ καὶ ἀμβλείῃσι κεραίαις

[*] I would like to express my gratitude to Antony Augoustakis, Marco Fucecchi, and Kathryn Chew for always being available for helpful discussions.

[1] The employment of the Aratean tradition of the catasterism of the Argo (V. Fl. 1.1–4 and 4.689–693) is discussed by Darcy Krasne in this volume, pp. 33–48. On the allusions to Aratus in the last book of the poem (V. Fl. 8. 56–63, 109–126), see most recently Castelletti (2012c).

[2] A general account of acrostics can be found in Graf (1893); Vogt (1967); Courtney (1990); Damschen (2004) 88–94; Luz (2010) 1–77. See also Castelletti (2008) and (2012a); Katz (2012) 4–10.

τέτρατον ἐκ τριτάτοιο φόως ἀμενηνὸν ἔχουσα
ἢ νότῳ ἄμβλυνται ἢ ὕδατος ἐγγὺς ἐόντος. (Arat. *Phaen.* 778–787)

> Observe first the moon at her two horns. Different evenings paint her with different light, and different shapes at different times horn the moon as soon as she is waxing, some on the third day, some on the fourth; from these you can learn about the month that has just begun. If slender and clear about the third day, she will bode fair weather; if slender and very red, wind; if the crescent is thickish, with blunted horns, having a feeble fourth-day light after the third day, either it is blurred by a southerly or because rain is in the offing.

First observed by Jacques,[3] the acrostic ΛΕΠΤΗ is the most famous case in Aratus' *Phaenomena*. The word λεπτή (783) can be read horizontally, but also vertically, forming a so-called "gamma acrostic."[4] The same word can also be read diagonally, as it has been observed recently.[5] Scholars have noted that Aratus embeds hints in his text to signal the presence of an acrostic:[6] namely, at 778, σκέπτεο δὲ πρῶτον κεράων (ἑκάτερθε σελήνην) is an indication that one should "look first at the edges," that is, the "edges" of the verses. Indeed, Virgil seems to have read it thus, since he uses the same technique in the *Georgics* to signal the presence of his syllabic acrostic MA VE PV, commonly considered as the poet's signature (MAro VErgilius PVblius).[7] The hints to the acrostic should be read in *sequentis / ordine respicies* (Virg.

---

[3] Jacques (1960).

[4] For this definition, see Morgan (1993) 143.

[5] For a discussion and an updated bibliography on the multiple letter-plays in this passage, see Hanses (forthcoming).

[6] E.g., Feeney and Nelis (2005).

[7] si uero solem ad rapidum lunasque *sequentis*
ordine respicies, numquam te crastina fallet
hora, neque insidiis noctis capiere serenae.
luna *reuertentis cum primum* colligit ignis,
si nigrum obscuro comprenderit aëra cornu,
MAximus agricolis pelagoque parabitur imber;
at si *uirgineum* suffuderit ore ruborem,
VEntus erit: uento semper rubet aurea Phoebe.
sin ortu quarto (*namque is certissimus auctor*)
PVra neque obtunsis per caelum cornibus ibit .... (Virg. *G.* 1.424–433)

> But if you pay heed to the swift sun and the moons, as they follow in order, never will tomorrow's hour cheat you, nor will you be ensnared by a cloudless night. Soon as the moon gathers her returning fires, if she encloses a dark mist within dim horns, a heavy rain is awaiting farmers and seamen. But if at her fourth rising—for that is our surest guide—she pass through the sky and with undimmed horns ...

On this acrostic, first identified by Brown (1963) 102–105, see most recently Somerville (2010).

G. 1.424–425), *reuertentis cum primum* (427), *uirgineum* (430, an allusion to the nickname *Parthenias*), and *namque is certissimus auctor* (432). Virgil will use the same technique again in the *Aeneid* to hint at the acrostic MARS (*Aen.* 7.601–604) which is coupled with the explicit phrase *prima mouent … Martem* ("first rouse Mars," 603).[8] In what follows, I would like to demonstrate that Valerius Flaccus too is very well aware of these techniques, as he uses them to compose some of his own acrostics.[9]

Let us begin with a case in point. The influence of the Aratean tradition is particularly striking in a crucial passage on Lemnos. After describing the Pleiades' and Astraea's storm-generating effect (V. Fl. 2.357–366), Valerius introduces Tiphys' moon observations, which are clearly inspired by the relevant passage in Aratus and its Virgilian adaptation, as we have seen above:[10]

PLIADA LEGE POLI NIMBOSO MOVERAT ASTRO
IVPPITER AETERNVM VOLVENS OPVS ET SIMVL VNDIS
CVNCTA RVVUNT VNOQVE DEI PANGAEA SVB ICTV
GARGARAQVE ET MAESTI STETERANT FORMIDINE LVCI
SAEVIOR HAVD ALIO MORTALES TEMPORE GENTES
TERROR AGIT TVNC VRGET ENIM, TVNC FLAGITAT IRAS
IN POPVLOS ASTRAEA IOVEM TERRISQVE RELICTIS
INVOCAT ADSIDVO SATVRNIA SIDERA QVESTV
INSEQVITVR NIGER ET MAGNIS CVM FRATRIBVS EVRVS
INTONAT AEGAEO TENDITQVE AD LITORA PONTUS.
ET LUNAM *QVARTO DENSAM* VIDET IMBRIBUS *ORTV*
THESPIADES LONGVS COEPTIS ET ***F***__L__VCTIBUS *ARCET*
QVI METVS VSQVE *__NO__VOS* DIVAE MELIORIS *AD IGNES*
VRBE *SEDENT LAETI* **MI**NYAE VIDVISQVE ***V*** **A**CAN*TES*
INDVLGENT **T**HALAMIS **NI**MBOSQVE ***E***DVCERE **LVXV**
NEC IAM VELLE VIAS ZEPHYROSQVE *AVDIRE VOC*__*A*__N*TES*
__D__ISSIMVLANT DONEC RESIDES *T*IRYNTHIVS HEROS
NON TVLIT IPSE *RATI __IN__VIGILANS* ATQVE INTEGER VRBIS
IN_VIDISSE_ DEOS TANTVM MARIS AEQVOR ADORTIS
DESERTASQVE DOMOS FRAVDATAQVE TEMPORE SEGNI
VOTA PATRVM QVID ET *IPSE VIRIS CUNCTANTIBVS ADSIT*

(V. Fl. 2.357–377)

8 See Fowler (1983).

9 Unless otherwise stated, all the acrostics discussed in these pages are my own findings, except for the Valerian HINC (5.596–599), ANNI (6.325–328), ODIA (7.255–258), IPHI (7.401–404), PACE (8.391–394), first observed, but all labeled as unintentional by Hilberg (1899).

10 Since the position of every letter in this passage is relevant, I reproduce the Latin text in capitals and without punctuation.

> By heaven's law Jove had drawn the Pleiads' stormy constellation down from the firmament as he rolled the earth upon its everlasting course, and straightway rain streams everywhere, and at one blow from the god Pangaea and Gargara and the forests of Moesia stood terror-stricken. At no other season of the year does fiercer fear sway men's hearts; for then does Astraea urge her plea, then does she implore Jove's anger against the nations, and leaving the earth importunes Saturn's star with her complaint. Then follows the darkling South-west wind, and with his strong brethren thunders upon the Aegean main, and all the sea strains shoreward; and at her fourth rising Thespian Tiphys sees the moon misty through rain, and fear thereat keeps the Minyans long from their task and from the waves. Ever waiting until the goddess in kinder mood should show her fires once more, they rest glad at heart in the city, and free from toil give themselves up to the marriage-bed; they spend the days of tempest in delicate living, nor wish any more for seafaring, and feign not to hear the breezes calling, until the hero of Tiryns brooked their sloth no longer, as himself he watched the ship, nor knew the city's taint. The gods, he cries, are jealous of them for assailing the spaces of the sea; they have deserted their homes and the prayers of their elders are mocked by these days of idleness. Why should he, aye he, be there to help dalliers?

Critics have already pointed out several verbal similarities with the Aratean and Virgilian text (especially at l. 367)[11] but something relevant seems to have gone unnoticed. Both Aratus and Virgil have used their description of the phases of the moon to insert meaningful acrostics (ΛΕΠΤΗ and MA VE PV), and Valerius too composes something very elaborate, entirely inspired by his main sources. Lines 367–371 spell the linear acrostic ET QVI. These two words can also be read as a gamma acrostic[12] (ET, 367–368; QVI, 369–371), just as the Aratean ΛΕΠΤΗ. But let us consider the last line of the acrostic (371). The reader is invited to pay special attention to that line by the hints provided at lines 367–368 (the moon is dense at her fourth rising). Indeed, if we take the first letters of each word (i.e., an acronym), beginning with the last (*Luxu*) and ending with the first (*Indulgent*), the sequence spells LENTI ("sluggish, procrastinating"). Although there is no obvious reason to explain the insertion of a backward acronym (Alexandrian poets had already used several types of wordplay in their compositions),[13] given that Virgil inserts his acrostic syllabic signature backwards (signaled by

11 See, e.g., Poortvliet (1991) 206 and Liberman (1997) 199–200.

12 I thank Darcy Krasne for suggesting to me that ET QVI can also be read as a gamma acrostic. See also Krasne (forthcoming) on Tiphys' portrayal as the poet's Aratean guide.

13 For examples and bibliography, see most recently Hanses (forthcoming).

reuertentis cum primum, *G.* 1.427),[14] Valerius might also be following his source *cum uariatione*; perhaps the poet provides a hint for this reversed order of reading through *audiRE VOCANTES / dissimulant* (372–373). If we combine the acrostic ET QVI with the backwards acronym LENTI, the resulting sentence *et qui lenti* ("and those sluggish [men]") fittingly describes the Argonauts at this very moment: *sedent laeti*, *indulgent thalamis*, *resides*. The acronym LENTI not only fits the content of the passage but is also "graphically" very similar to the word ΛΕΠΤΗ: both are five-letter words, three of which are exactly the same (L, E, T). Moreover, LENTI is also similar to LAETI, the adjective describing the Argonauts in the previous line (370). All these similarities highlight and strengthen the relationship between the acrostic-acronym combination and the context of the passage, as well as cumulatively support the intentionality of this composition.

Furthermore, there are other reasons that justify the insertion of these specific words, at this very moment of the narrative. As several critics have pointed out, the Lemnos episode challenges the epic poem by importing the elegiac theme of love. Thanks to Hercules' intervention, Jason promptly reacts, ordering the Argonauts to leave the island and to continue the journey towards Colchis. Jason's determination to leave Hypsipyle and to close the Lemnian amorous interlude also corresponds to the poet's intention to lead the poem back to its epic path, and this is reflected in a metapoetic reference to *arma uirumque* in the last two verses of the episode (2.391–392).[15] Such a metapoetic role of LENTI is reinforced by the use of the adjective, for instance, in Virgil's first *Eclogue*:[16] *tu, Tityre*, lentus *in umbra / formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas* ("you, Tityrus, at ease beneath the shade, teach the woods to re-echo 'fair Amaryllis'," Virg. *Ecl.* 1.4–5). The Rutulians are also *qui lenti* as described at the end of Juturna's speech: *nos patria amissa dominis parere superbis / cogemur*, qui nunc lenti *consedimus aruis* ("but we, our country lost, will submit perforce to haughty masters—we, who today sit listless in the fields!" *Aen.* 12.236–237). Besides the verbal reprise of *qui lenti* (and perhaps an echo of *consedimus* in the Valerian *sedent laeti*), the two passages share an important similarity: Juturna's speech causes the immediate reaction of the *lenti* Rutulians (*Aen.* 12.238), and Hercules' words have

---

14 Somerville (2010) provides a full and convincing explanation of why Virgil composed it backwards.

15 On the implications of *arma uiros* (2.392), see Feeney (1991) 323 and Hershkowitz (1998) 117.

16 On acrostics and metapoetic meanings in the first *Eclogue*, see Castelletti (2012a) 90–92.

the same effect on Jason (V. Fl. 2.385) and the Argonauts. The Valerian passage also embeds other metapoetic allusions through Hercules' actions. The Tirynthian hero is described as *rati inuigilans*. Given the Aratean subtext of the passage, the choice of the verb *inuigilare* recalls Cinna's epigram: *haec tibi Arateis multum inuigilata* [codd.] *lucernis / carmina* ("these songs which many a sleepless night has produced by the lamps of Aratus," fr. 11 Courtney). Since *ratis* can also be construed allegorically to stand for the poem itself,[17] describing Hercules as *inuigilans rati* allusively portrays the Tirynthian as a poet who spends sleepless nights working on his text (the famous ἀγρυπνίη). Of course in Hellenistic poetry, the ἀγρυπνίη alludes to a Callimachean aesthetic (λεπτή),[18] as opposed to the epic enterprise (παχύς), but for a Flavian poet the *labor limae* during sleepless nights has become a common task, even when writing epic, as witnessed, for instance, by Statius' *Thebaid*, which is addressed by its composer as *multum uigilata* (Stat. *Theb*. 12.811). In the Lemnos passage, Hercules is allegorically watching over the poem, and as the champion of an archaic vision of heroism, he ensures the elegiac interlude will not compromise the epic narrative. The relevant role of the Tirynthian hero seems also to be highlighted through another letter play. Indeed, if we take the first letter of every penultimate word from line 368 (*Fluctibus*) to 373 (*Tirynthius*), the sequence spells FAVEAT. Considering that this is the same verb used by Ovid to describe Augustus' catasterism at the end of the *Metamorphoses* (Ov. *Met*. 15.870), I wonder whether in this Aratean context Valerius is also hinting at Hercules' future catasterism (allusively described in V. Fl. 8.109–126, as I discuss in Castelletti [2012c]) and his role of beneficent god.

The Aratean and Virgilian intertext seems fairly evident. What I would like to argue now, is that in this same passage Valerius has also concealed his own *sphragis*. Although we know little about his life and origins, that *CAIVS VALERIVS FLACCVS* was at least the initial part of his name seems to be clear.[19] Conflating both the Virgilian and the Aratean model, Valerius appends a reversed, skipped line syllabic signature *CA*(*ius*) *VA*(*lerius*)

17 See Stover (2010).

18 Many critics have repeatedly asserted that the main function of the Aratean acrostic ΛΕΠΤΗ is to announce the poetic manifesto of λεπτότης; see Jacques (1960); Kidd (1997) 445–446; Martin (1998) 2.472. The λεπτότης is indeed a central concept of Aratean poetics, but some scholars disagree with the *communis opinio* that this concept is also relevant for Callimachus' aesthetics and that the acrostic states a poetic program; on this debate, see Luz (2010) 50–51 and Volk (2010) 205–208.

19 See e.g. Zissos (2008) xiii–xiv.

FL(*accus*), which can be read diagonally in lines 372, 370 and 368. The intentionality of this composition seems to be supported by several signposts. As we learn from Aratus himself, we have to begin from Zeus (Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, Arat. *Phaen.* 1). Indeed, if we draw a line from the word IVPPITER at the beginning of line 358, until the end of line 373 (which ends with *Tirynthius heros*), the *tria nomina* of the poet are exactly aligned on that line. The hint for the reversed order of reading is provided through audiRE VOCAntes, which also embeds the first syllable of the *tria nomina*. According to the hints provided at lines 367–368 (*lunam densam … quarto ortu*), in line 371 the "moon" is dense. Indeed, line 371 not only holds the aforementioned acronym LENTI but also other important features. In the very middle of the line, the syllable NI, is the last part of the word NOMINI,[20] which is spelled out by the words *NOuos* (369), *MInyae* (370), and *NImbosque* (371). Once again, the word NOMINI can be read diagonally, if we draw a line from the Jupiter of line 358, until the T of *Tirynthius* (373). Therefore, is the son of Jupiter *inuigilans nomini*, besides *rati*? At any rate, *nomini* could also be construed with *faueat* (368–373, discussed above) or *uacantes* (370), another meaningful verb, in emphatic position. Besides, in ***uacan***tes, as well as in *uocan*tes (372), we can read not only two of the *tria nomina* (VA and CA), but maybe also part of Valerius' supposed *cognomen Setinus*, in the last three letters TES, if read backwards: *SET*(*inus*). Thus Valerius Flaccus seems to provide another aspect of his identity. If we consider lines 369–373, the sequence spelled by the first letters is QVIND: an allusion to Valerius' presumed affiliation with the ***quind****ecimuiri sacris faciundis*?[21] Of course nothing could be less certain, but if we consider that the five-letter acrostic QVIND spans over five lines, the middle one of which is 371, the coincidence seems less fortuitous. Indeed, the three first letters of that line spell IND, which can be added to Q of *qui* (369) and V of *urbe* (370), to spell again QVIND. If we keep reading in the same direction, until the end of line 371, the last two letters are XV ("fifteen"), which recalls once again the QVIND(ECIM). Another coincidence? We can now better understand why the reader is invited to pay attention to line 371, which is loaded with meaning. As a matter of fact, the repetition of the syllable *IN* four times at the beginning of lines 363–366 (*IN, INuocat, INsequitur, INtonat*) resonates

---

20 I thank Darcy Krasne for pointing this out to me.

21 For Valerius as *quindecimuir*, see Boyancé (1935) (the description of Mopsus' ritual of purification is one of the key passages for Boyancé's argumentation) and Zissos (2008) xiii–xiv, with bibliography.

with *INdulgent* of 371 (but also reversed in *NImbosque*, 371), as well as the meaningful *INuiglians* (374) and *INuidisse* (375).

Other hints[22] seem to support this complex *sphragis* and its connection with catasterism (Valerius' aim is to put his name, as well as his poetry among the stars), but I will discuss further evidence in another contribution. Clearly inspired by its Aratean and Virgilian models, this sophisticated composition ultimately shows how Valerius masters the well-known principle of conflation (and also "window reference")[23] to mark a meaningful and crucial passage of his poem.

Let us now consider another elaborate case. The passage is situated at the beginning of the description of the cave, where Amycus has killed many men, and where he himself will shortly be slain by Pollux in a boxing match:

> haec ubi non ulla iuuenes formidine moti
> accipiunt (dulce et dura sic pergere mente),
> terga *sequi* properosque *iubet coniungere gressus*.
> **L**itore *in extremo* spelunca *apparuit* ingens
> **A**rboribus super et dorso contecta minanti,
> **N**on quae dona deum, non quae trahat aetheris ignem,
> **I**nfelix domus et sonitu tremebunda profundi.
> **At** uarii pro rupe metus: hinc trunca rotatis
> **B**racchia rapta uiris strictoque immortua caestu
> **O**ssaque taetra situ ⟨et⟩ *capitum maestissimus ordo*;
> ***R****espicias quibus* aduerso sub uulnere *nulla*
> *iam facies nec nomen erat*; media ipsius arma
> sacra metu[que] magnique aris imposta parentis. (V. Fl. 4.174–186)
> 184 *respicias* Carrio, *respiceas* LV, *per piceas* Madvig

> The youths listen undisturbed, and seeing that they persist with unimpaired resolve he bids them to follow behind and add their speed to his. On the limit of the strand was seen a mighty cave, covered by trees above and a threatening ridge of rock, debarred from heaven's blessings and from the sky's radiance, a grim abode that trembled with the roaring of the deep. But before the rock were various terrors: severed arms torn from men sent flying, and lifeless though still clad with the gauntlet, and bones all foul and moldering, and heads in a dismal row. You could see those for whom the straight-pitched blow had left nor name nor face; in the middle were the weapons of the monarch himself, held sacred through fear and placed on the altar of his mighty father.

---

[22] See, e.g., *Thespiades ... arcet* (368), *nouos ... ad ignes* (369), *educere* (371), *ipse uiris cunctantibus adsit* (377), *SAturnia* (364), *TVnc* (362), *gargaRAque* (360).

[23] For the use of these techniques (definitions are by R. Thomas) to compose acrostics, see, e.g., Somerville (2010) 208–209.

Valerius composes the acrostic LANIABOR (177–184), "I will be pulled to pieces." First noticed by Isidorus Hilberg, the acrostic is considered among the very rare intentional cases, given its exceptional length and how it fits within the narrative passage.[24] Given the context, the acrostic is indeed appropriate and sounds like a prophetic comment on the monster's ensuing destiny. But the intentionality can be proved also by means other than just the context. In the last line before the acrostic (176), we might take *iubet coniungere gressus* as an invitation "to put the lines together" (*gressus* in the meaning of "metrical foot" is used, for instance, by Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.250 and 5.3.99). In the first line of the acrostic (177) we read *in extremo … apparuit*; then we could consider the *respicias* of line 184 as an invitation to the reader to "look back" in the text, and therefore, to read the preceding sequence of the acrostic.[25] *Respicere* is the same verb employed by Virgil to hint at his syllabic acrostic MA VE PV (*G.* 1.425), as we have seen above. In addition, we also find in Valerius the verb *sequi* (176) and the word *ordo* (183) right before *respicere*; the phrase *capitum maestissimus ordo* can be interpreted as a reference to the sequence of *capita*, that is, the first "letters" of the lines that compose the acrostic. *OLD* 16 and *TLL* 3.416.4–18 provide several examples of *caput* meaning "the beginning (of a word or sentence); initial letter," most of which are used in funerary inscriptions where the presence of an acrostic (usually the name of the dead person) is signaled to the reader: e.g. IAM SI QVERIS NOMEN, CAPITA VERSORVM REQVIRE ("If you look for a name, seek the beginning of the verses," *CIL* 14.2224b.7), CAPITA NUNC VERSORVM INSPICE … AGNOSCES NOMEN CONIVGIS GRATAE MEAE ("Now look at the beginning of the verses … you will recognize the name of my charming wife," *CIL* 6.28753.10–12).[26] Scholars have pointed out how Valerius' description of Amycus' cave, if compared with its main models (Polyphemus' cave in Homer, Cacus' in Virgil and Ovid), contains ominous and lurid additions, which enhance the funereal context.[27] As such, the acrostic LANIABOR, signaled by words often used to point to funerary

24 See Hilberg (1899) 269–270. In Hilberg's list, there are only two other occurrences of eight-letter acrostics (which is also the longest type): DICTAEIS (Claud. 20.434–441) and PETIIQVE (Ven. Fort. 2.139–146).

25 Though attractive (cf. Murgatroyd [2009] 112), Madvig's generally accepted conjecture *per piceas* for *respicias* (184) should be rejected.

26 On acrostic inscriptions, see most recently Garulli (2012) and Mairs (2012).

27 Murgatroyd (2009) 109–113. Amycus' gloomy cave, covered by trees and a threatening ridge of rock, really looks like a *tumulus*, and words like *extremo* (177) and *contecta* (178) enhance this impression.

acrostics, looks like an epitaph. Of course *laniabor* is not a name, and the poet seems to explain to the reader that, unlike the inscriptions on some gravestones, this one does not provide the name (nor the portrait) of the deceased: *nulla facies nec nomen erat* (184–185). Lastly, one wonders whether we can also spot an allusion to the literary tradition, as if Valerius, who has carefully read Aratus and Virgil, had wanted to add an ironic *sphragis* by avoiding inserting his signature here (*nulla facies, nec nomen*), unlike Aratus who puns with his name at the beginning of his poem (ἄρρητον, *Phaen.* 1–2)[28] or Virgil, who has appended his signature with the acrostic MA VE PV.

LANIABOR is certainly the largest acrostic of the *Argonautica*, but Valerius has composed many other interesting ones. In the first part of book 3, the poet narrates the episode of the involuntary massacre of the Doliones. According to his version, the crime does not result in a storm, as in Apollonius, but in an immobilizing sense of guilt that blocks the Argonauts at Cyzicus. Mopsus then performs rituals to purify the men and to appease the shades of the slain. At the beginning of the purification ritual, when Mopsus approaches the Argo's crew, the text presents a very particular acrostic:

> **A**tque *Argoa manus* uariis *insignis in armis*
> **I**bat agens lectas aurata fronte bidentes.
> ***D**elius* hic longe candenti ueste *sacerdos*
> **O**ccurrit ramoque uocat iamque ipse recenti
> **S**tat tumulo placida transmittens agmina lauro. (V. Fl. 3.430–434)

> And the crew of the Argo marched, splendid in manifold accoutrement, leading chosen sheep with gilded foreheads. Then the Delian priest in white robe shining from afar hastens to meet them and beckons with a branch; and now taking his stand upon the newly made mound he touches with propitious bay-leaf the troops as they pass by him.

The acrostic reads AIDOS, and this would be the first known example of a Greek word (αἰδώς) used in acrostic within a Latin poem.[29] The intentionality of the acrostic can be supported by several considerations. Αἰδώς is a notoriously difficult word to translate because of its wide range of connotations. Valerius seems to play on several of these meanings, such as "shame, compassion, sense of honor," since they all fit well in the context of the purification ritual. The acrostic can be perceived as a commentary on the scene, made by the poet *in margine*, or as a ritual word expressed in such

---

28 On the wordplay (a "speaking name" that literally means "unspoken"), see, e.g., Katz (2008) 111–116.

29 I have discussed this acrostic in Castelletti (2012b).

a way by the priest himself: the Argonauts are ashamed of what they have just perpetrated, and they show compassion and regard for their friends, the Doliones. At the same time, the ritual has a precise function, which corresponds to a specific meaning of αἰδώς. In fact, this acrostic is inspired by a Homeric verse: αἰδὼς Ἀργεῖοι κάκ' ἐλέγχεα εἶδος ἀγητοί ("Shame! Argives, base objects of reproach, fair in appearance only!" Hom. *Il.* 5.787 and 8.228). As we can see, Valerius puts αἰδώς in acrostic and also employs in the first line the Greek Ἀργεῖοι in the Latin *Argoa manus* in the same metrical position, as well as the Greek phrase εἶδος ἀγητοί in the Latin adjective *insignis* (with *in uariis armis* to complete the aesthetic image). Furthermore, one cannot rule out the possibility that Homer himself toys with the words αἰδώς / εἶδος. The Homeric verse points to a major function of the word αἰδώς: it is used to instigate the combatants to action. The acrostic AIDOS, right at the very beginning of the purification ritual, sounds then like an exclamation, an invitation to react, which the priest (poet) addresses to the warriors, since they need to recover their heroic status. As the reader knows, Mopsus is a key character, not only in the Cyzicus episode, but in the entire poem, and this acrostic expresses a *doctrina sacerdotalis* (it is a ritual formula uttered by the *Delius sacerdos*) and a *doctrina poetica* (uttered by the author of the Latin *Argonautica*).[30]

In book 4, Valerius' Orpheus sings about Io and her crossing of the Bosporus to entertain the Argonauts as they approach that stretch of water. In this episode, we encounter a couple of intriguing acrostics.[31] The first one could help support the interpretation of those scholars who read the whole episode as predominantly comic.[32] As noted by Paul Murgatroyd,[33] Valerius innovates on the Ovidian model of Io's tale by developing the picture of a sadistic Argus persecuting the nymph / cow. The Flavian poet increases the (mock) pathos with *heu* and other exclamations (V. Fl. 4.378–380), as he makes Argus expose Io to greater hardship than what she had (already) suffered in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Besides, Valerius adds new details by having Argus wear the maiden down utterly, depriving her of water for a long time, even flogging her and driving her to the point of contemplating suicide:

30 On Valerius as *doctus poeta*, see Zissos (2008) xlii–xlvi and Stover (2010).

31 The problematic sequence IESVS (V. Fl. 4.350–354; cf. Stat. *Theb.* 6.499–503 and Sil. 4.326–330) was first observed (and labeled as a "Zufall") by Hilberg (1899) 299. IASVS would have been a more interesting word (but the text is hardly corrupted): *Iasus* is the Latin form of Ἴασος, Io's father (Apollod. 2.1.3), and Io herself is called *uirgo Iasia* at 4.353 (a unique periphrasis and unique adjective, on which see Murgatroyd [2009] 183).

32 Murgatroyd (2009) 177–210.

33 E.g., Murgatroyd (2009) 192–195.

fleuit Amymone, flerunt Messeides undae,
fleuit et effusis reuocans Hyperia lacertis.
Illa, ubi uel fessi tremerent erroribus artus
Vel rueret summo iam frigidus aethere uesper,
***H**eu* quotiens saxo posuit latus aut, ubi longa
***A**egra siti*, quos ore lacus, quae pabula carpsit,
Verbere candentes quotiens exhorruit armos!
Quin et *ab excelso* meditantem *uertice* saltus
Audentemque mori ualles citus *egit in imas*
Argus et arbitrio durus seruauit erili ... (V. Fl. 4.374–383)

Amymone wailed, Messeis' waters wailed, Hyperia wailed with arms outstretched to call her back. But she, when her limbs trembled, weary of her wandering, or when now chilly evening sped down from heaven's height—ah! how often laid she her body on a stone, or when long thirst made her faint, what pools did her lips drink, what pastures graze, how often did her white shoulders quail before the lash! But even as she was daring death and was planning to leap from some lofty height, swift did Argus drive her down to the valley beneath and cruelly saved her at his queen's behest ...

As noticed by scholars, there is a flippant touch in a water nymph portrayed as thirsty (*aegra siti*, 379). But no one has noticed that Valerius also inserts the reversed acrostic AQVAHVI, i.e., *aqua, hui*! (382–376).[34] By embedding a reference to water, right "under the nose" of the poor thirsty nymph (but hidden in a reversed acrostic), Valerius increases the mock pathos of the scene. The intentionality of the acrostic can be supported not only by the context, but also because *aegra siti* is exactly in the central line (379),[35] in addition to being the phrase in which the acrostic AQVA ends. We can also observe that the onomatopoeic interjection *hui* (used, e.g., by Plautus and Cicero as an exclamation of surprise or other strong emotions; cf. *OLD* s.v. *hui*) originates from *heu* (378), which is another interjection. I would also add that the phrase *egit in imas* (382) (and maybe also the phrase *ab excelso ... uertice*, 381) could be construed as a sign for the reader to realize the presence of the acrostic.

34 Reversed acrostics can also be found in Aratus, e.g., τόσα (*Phaen.* 1060–1063) originating from τόσσα (a sort of "reversed gamma acrostic"). The presence of this acrostic (to my knowledge, as yet unnoticed) seems to be supported by the signpost σήματ' (1061), used in the same way by Aratus at 247 (reversed acrostic πάσα, 246–249) and 805 (acrostic πάσα, 803–806), on which see Danielewicz (forthcoming).

35 It is often in the central line of the acrostic that the poet conceals the most significant words. See, e.g., *Delius ... sacerdos* at V. Fl. 3.432 (acrostic AIDOS). For other examples in other poets, see Damschen (2004) 108.

In Orpheus' Io song, Valerius also composes an intriguing and elaborate acrostic:

> … iamque refecta Ioui paulatim in imagine prisca
> ibat agris Io uictrix Iunonis et ecce
> cum facibus spirisque et Tartareo ululatu
> Tisiphonen uidet: ac primo *uestigia uisu*
> *figit* et in miserae *rursus bouis ora recurrit*.
> **n**ec qua ualle memor ⟨nec⟩ quo se *uertice sista**t***
> **I**nachias errore etiam defertur ad unda**s**,
> **q**ualis et a *prima quantum mutata* iuuenc**a**!
> **Nec** pater aut trepidae temptant accedere nymphae.
> **E**rgo iterum siluas, iterum petit inuia retro
> *Ceu Styga dilectum fugiens caput*. inde per urbes
> **R**aptatur Graias atque ardua flumina ripis,
> **O**blato donec paulum cunctata profundo
> **I**ncidit. absistunt fluctus et gnara futuri
> dant pauida alta uiam, *celsis* procul ipsa *refulget*
> *cornibus* ac summa palearia sustinet unda.
> ast Erebi uirgo ditem uolat aethere Memphin
> praecipere et Pharia uenientem pellere terra.
> contra Nilus adest et toto gurgite torrens
> Tisiphonen agit atque imis inlidit harenis
> **D**itis opem ac saeui clamantem numina regni.
> *Apparent* sparsaeque faces disiectaque longe
> **V**erbera et abruptis excussi crinibus hydri.
> **N**ec Iouis interea cessat manus: intonat alto
> **I**nsurgens caelo genitor curamque fatetur
> **A**tque ipsa imperium Iuno pauet. haec procul Io
> *Spectat* ab arce ⟨Phari⟩, iam diuis addita iamque
> aspide cincta comas et ouanti persona sistro … (V. Fl. 4.391–418)

… And now, her former shape gradually restored by Jove, Io is walking the fields victorious over Juno, when, behold, she sees Tisiphone with brands of fire and coiling snakes and infernal yells; at the first sight she stops and passes once again into the shape of a hapless heifer, nor does she remember in what valley or on what height to stay her steps. Wandering she comes even to the waters of Inachus. How faring and changed was she from that first heifer! Nor do her father or the frightened nymphs try to draw near her. Therefore once more she seeks the woods, once more the pathless wilds, fleeing from that dear head as from hateful Styx; and from there she is hurried through Greek towns and steep-banked rivers, until the deep waters meet her, and hesitating for a while she plunges in: the waves part, and the ocean foreknowing the future yields a path to her timid steps; with high horns she gleams afar and upholds her dewlaps on the summit of the wave. But the maiden of Erebus flies through the air to rich Memphis to be beforehand and repel the newcomer from the Pharian land. But Nile withstands Tisiphone and driving her with all his eddying flood plunges her to the depths

> of his sandy bed, calling for help to Dis and all the powers of that cruel realm; here and there are seen her brands and whips far scattered, and the serpents shaken from her disheveled hair. Nor meanwhile is Jove's hand idle; the father arising thunders from high heaven and makes his anger known, and Juno herself quails before his word. All this from Pharos' height afar Io beholds, now added to the gods, with snake-girt hair and loud triumphant sistrum …

In Valerius' account, Io is transformed into a heifer and then back to a nymph more than once. After Mercury kills Argus, Io is restored to her shape (391), but her triumph over Juno (392) is very short because of the appearance of Tisiphone, who will torture the girl even more harshly than her previous guardian (and even harder than Ovid's Fury). The scene is immediately filled by the infernal ululation (393), and the Fury forces the scared Io (now a cow) to wander around until she unexpectedly finds herself back at her father's waters. Whereas in Ovid Inachus and the nymphs do not approach the bovine Io because they do not recognize her, in Valerius they know who she is but they are too afraid even to attempt to approach her (*trepidae*, 399).

The first letters of verses 399–404 form the word NECROI, which I suggest as the transliteration of the Greek νεκροί ("dead"). But does this word suit the context? As we have already observed, the presence of Tisiphone brings out an infernal element in the narrative. Moreover, Io herself is already *a prima quantum mutata iuuenca* (398), and she will soon be transformed into the goddess Isis, queen of the Underworld. At line 401, Inachus is compared to the infernal river Styx, which hints again to the world of the dead.[36] Within such a dark context, it does not seem inappropriate to insert an allusion to the deceased, over whom the future goddess of the Underworld will rule. As for the signpost that announces the acrostic, consider, for instance, the phrase *prima quantum mutata* (398), where the reader is invited to understand *prima* as "the first letters," but also the phrase *celsis … refulget / cornibus* (405–406), which points once again to the Aratean use of the horns of the moon to signal the "edge" of the lines (cf. Arat. *Phaen.* 778), as discussed above.[37]

The acrostic NECROI therefore seems to be a plausible reading in this passage, but there are other reasons for its presence here. Hilberg observes that

---

36 On the comparison, see Murgatroyd (2009) 202.

37 Note also that the acrostic originates from the word *nec* (399), which is reproduced in the first three letters of ***necroi*** (recalling a gamma acrostic).

lines 411–417 spell the acrostic DAUNIAS,[38] a non-intentional occurrence. I submit that Hilberg's opinion should be corrected. The intentionality is supported by *apparent* (412) and *spectat* (417), words often used to capture the reader's attention (e.g., 4.177). But how would the word DAUNIAS function in this context? I argue that the acrostic does not involve the Latin word *Daunias* (which can be either nominative singular of the substantive *Daunia* or feminine accusative plural of the derived adjective *Daunius*, that is, "Apulian, Rutulian") but instead the Greek Δαυνίας, the genitive singular of Δαυνία ("Daunia, Apulia"). If we combine the two Greek words, we are to read νεκροὶ Δαυνίας, "the dead men of Apulia." But what would this mean? If we take a first look at the context, there is no apparent link to Apulia or the Apulians (dead or alive). Therefore, I suggest that we ask the one who most certainly holds the answer to our puzzling questions: Virgil.

Several scholars have noticed that the verse *praecipere et Pharia uenientem pellere terra* (V. Fl. 4.408) clearly alludes to a line from Virgil: *litora praecipere et uenientis pellere terra* ("seizing the shore and driving the approaching foe from land," Virg. *Aen.* 10.277), which in turn describes Turnus, who, maddened by a Fury, is trying to ward off the returning Trojan fleet, particularly Aeneas, described as an imposing figure with flames streaming down from his helmet and shield (10.270–271). I would like to draw attention to another Virgilian passage where we can find a more direct link between Turnus and Io:

> filius ardentis haud setius aequore camp**I**
> **E***xercebat equos curruque* in bella rueba**T**.
> **I**pse *inter primos* praestanti corpore Turnu**S**
> **V***ertitur* arma tenens et *toto uertice supra es**T***.
> **C**ui triplici crinita iuba galea alta Chimaeram
> sustinet Aetnaeos efflantem faucibus ignis;
> tam magis illa fremens et tristibus effera flammis
> quam magis effuso crudescunt sanguine pugnae.
> at leuem clipeum *sublatis cornibus* Io
> **A**uro *insignibat*, iam saetis obsita, iam bo**S**,
> **A***rgumentum ingens*, et custos uirginis Argu**S**,
> **C***aelataque* amnem fundens pater Inachus urn**A**. (Virg. *Aen.* 7.781–792)

> Nonetheless, his son was driving fiery horses on the level plain, and he hastened to war in his chariot. Among the foremost moves Turnus himself, of wondrous frame, holding sword in hard, and by a whole head overtopping all. His lofty helmet, crested with triple plume, bears a Chimaera, breathing

[38] Hilberg (1899) 305.

> from her jaws Aetnean fires, raging the more, and the madder with baleful flames, the more blood is shed and the fiercer waxes the fight. But on his polished shield Io with uplifted horns was emblazoned in gold—Io, wondrous device, already covered with bristles, already a heifer—and Argus, the maiden's warder, and father Inachus pouring his stream from an embossed urn.

The description of Turnus' arms has been well discussed, but there is something new I would like to add. Turnus' emblems include the fire-breathing Chimaera on the triple-crested helmet and Io on his shield. Io's presence can be explained based on Turnus' genealogy: Amata informs us that Turnus descends from Inachus (*Aen.* 7.372) and Acrisius. In addition, Turnus is also designated as *Argiua … pubes* ("Argive youth," *Aen.* 7.794). Scholars have rightly pointed out that there are also other reasons that justify the presence of Io as an appropriate emblem for Turnus' character and role in the narrative.[39] At *Aen.* 7.446–466, Turnus is "transformed" by Allecto, a metamorphosis that mirrors the story of Io, depicted on the shield. Moreover, Io is an innocent victim of the passion and jealousy of the gods, exemplifying the brutal power of *furor*.[40] The fire-breathing Chimaera on Turnus' helmet also resembles its wearer, who is a "fiery" character and "roars" for arms just as the monster roars in the heat of the battle.[41] In this respect, the image of Io suggests that Turnus is a victim, whether of the gods or of his own passions, while the monstrous Chimaera on his helmet gives a less sympathetic impression, implying that he is an enemy of reason, order, and the gods.[42] Ultimately, Turnus' arms reflect the ambiguity of his character and fate: he can be viewed either as a monster who must be killed (like the Chimaera) or as a victim of circumstances (like Io).

Let us take a closer look at Virgil's text. We can see that the Augustan poet embeds two acrostics that (to my knowledge) have gone unnoticed. As I have discussed elsewhere,[43] at the very beginning of the *Aeneid* (1.1–4), Virgil conceals his signature through the boustrophedon acrostic A STILO M(ARONIS) V(ERGILI).[44] This peculiar form of acrostic is inspired

---

39 For discussion and bibliography, see, e.g., Hardie (1992) 63; Gale (1997); and Horsfall (2000) 507–513.

40 Gale (1997) 183.

41 Gale (1997) 185.

42 Gale (1997) 187.

43 See Castelletti (2012a).

44 Technically it would be more correct to call it an acrostic-*cum*-telestich, but we will keep the simplified definition of boustrophedon acrostic, which immediately suggests the idea of this particular type of reading.

by the boustrophedon acrostic ΙΔΜΗΙ (ἰδμοσύνῃ) which Aratus places at the beginning of his poem (*Phaen.* 6–8), hinting at its presence by means of keywords.[45] In the invocation of the Muse (*Aen.* 1.8–11), Virgil also composes the boustrophedon acrostic MOS Q(u)IS EI (= *quis mos ei*?).[46] If we attempt a boustrophedon reading of the first and last letters of *Aen.* 7.783–785, beginning with the letter I of *ipse*, and ending with the letter C of *cui*, the sequence spells out: ISTVC. If we also consider the previous two lines, starting with the final letter I of *campi*, we can also add ITE. Hence the whole sequence would read: *ite istuc*, that is, "go there!" The presence of the acrostic is signposted through (*ipse*) *inter primos … uertitur* (783–784) and *toto uertice supra est* (784). Indeed, the use of *uertere* and *uertex* (in the same line) recalls the turning and twisting of the acrostic through the first letters (*inter primos*). In addition, we should not rule out the possibility that the phrase *exercebat equos curruque* (782) could allude to the practice of reading boustrophedon as well. But why does the invitation urge the reader to go *istuc*, and not *huc*? I suggest we follow the hint and move a little further (7.792), where we repeat the same operation, but this time backwards. That is, a boustrophedon reading, starting with the letter A of *urna* (792), then the letter C of *caelataque*, the letter A of *argumentum*, the letter S of *Argus*, S of *bos*, and A of *auro*. The whole sequence spells now ACASSA, which I propose to read as *ac assa*. I take *assa* as nominative singular feminine of adjective *assus* ("roasted or baked; without moisture, dry"), deriving from the verb *areo* ("to be dry or parched; to be withered from lack of moisture (of plants, animals or tissue); to suffer from thirst, be dry (of persons)"). As for the signpost, I take *sublatis cornibus … insignibat* as an allusion to the horns of the moon that signal the acrostic at Arat. *Phaen.* 778.[47] Particularly striking is the choice of a verb (*in*signi*bat*) echoing the very Aratean σημαίνειν,[48] used, for instance, at Arat. *Phaen.* 6–8 (δεξιὰ σημαίνει … βουσί) to hint at the presence of the boustrophedon acrostic; in this respect, in my opinion, the choice of placing *bos* at the very end of the same line goes in the same direction.

45 See Castelletti (2012a) 85–87. Jerzy Danielewicz suggests to me that if we apply the same boustrophedon reading (from right to left) to Arat. *Phaen.* 1–2, the acrostic sequence spells NEAI, which could be either nominative plural νέαι or dative singular νέᾳ (to be referred to ἰδμῇ?).

46 I will discuss this problematic acrostic in a future study.

47 Note that Virgil's acrostic ISTVC starts at line 783, the same as for the Aratean λεπτή. A coincidence?

48 On the importance of signs and the use of verbs such as σημαίνω in Aratus, see, e.g., Castelletti (2012a) 87–88 and Volk (2012).

Lastly, *caelataque* at the beginning of the last (or the first) line of the acrostic (792) highlights the general impression that the whole passage is crafted in an Alexandrian way, and I would not rule out the fact that Virgil might be playing here with a Varronian etymology, making a pun on *c(a)elata*.[49] The acrostic is indeed not only *caelatum* ("embossed") but also *celatum* ("concealed"). Still, we need to ascertain why *ac assa* makes sense in this passage. I suggest two possible explanations, which are by no means mutually exclusive. The first is to relate *ac assa* to *urna* (7.792). *Pater Inachus* is pouring the water of the river out of an urn which remains dry: *urna caelata ... ac assa* (a little touch of humor?).[50] The second would be to associate *assa* with *Io*, who is *iam saetis obsita, iam bos ... ac assa*. In this case, I would translate *assa* with the meaning of "roasted, burned by fire" and connect this image with the other scene sealed by an acrostic, the one with the Chimaera. Io would be burned by the flames of the spit-firing Chimaera (*efflantem faucibus ignis*, 7.786), an image reflecting once again Turnus' ambiguous character and destiny. Indeed, at *Aen.* 7.458–466, Virgil compares Turnus' anger to a cauldron gradually boiling over, developing the Lucretian image of the angry man (or lion) with an excess of fire in his soul, which causes "waves of anger" to overflow his breast.[51] According to the well-discussed theme of metamorphosis in *Aeneid* 7,[52] Turnus' transformation by Allecto (on behalf of Juno) into a frenzied, fiery monster (like the Chimaera) parallels and contrasts his other metamorphosis from an innocent human into a beast (like Io). As Philip Hardie observes, "the flames of Allecto's torch will fuel the martial fieriness of Turnus until the final chill of death in the penultimate line of the poem (*Aen.* 12.951, *frigore*); that dying chill forms a contrasting ring with the lion's heat in the simile at the beginning of the book (*Aen.* 12.3–9)."[53] The fire of the Chimaera will eventually burn the innocent Io, and this destiny is reflected on Turnus' weapons and reverberated by the acrostics inserted herein. The question whether Virgil ultimately intends to be serious or just to make a pun (after all a *bos assa* is a roasted cow!) remains open, but, as I submit, the presence of two acrostics in such an important passage of the poem could not be fortuitous.

49 On the idea of *ars est c(a)elare artem*, see Ahl (1985) 64–69.

50 Hilberg (1899) 273 considers that the linear acrostic ASSA at Stat. *Theb.* 9.496–499 is unintentional. He is probably right, but the fact that the acrostic ends on *arentem* (499) and is inserted in a passage describing a tree halfway between earth and water, renders the case less obvious. Had Statius noticed the Virgilian *ac assa*?

51 See Gale (1997) 182.

52 See, e.g., Putnam (1970); Hardie (1992) 62–75.

53 Hardie (1992) 65.

Moreover, we can add further evidence to support the intentionality of these occurrences. If we return to Valerius' *Argonautica*, we can understand better why the Flavian poet composes his acrostics within Io's tale in book 4. The first one *aqua, hui* (V. Fl. 4.382–376) does not need any further justifications (Argus' sadism), but I would not rule out the possibility that the acrostic *ac assa* (if interpreted as "thirsty cow") could have assisted Valerius' inspiration. The νεκροὶ Δαυνίας acrostic alludes to Turnus, the Rutulians, and the other Daunians allies that perish in the conflict against Aeneas and the Trojans. Why would Valerius use the Greek words? It is impossible to give a sure answer, but, in addition to the widespread use of *uariatio*, the choice may be due to the common Greek origins from Inachus which Turnus and Io share. Thus not only does Valerius find the way to refer to a mythological detail which would hardly find a place in Orpheus' singing of Io's tale, but he also proves once again his profound knowledge of his sources with which he engages in a competition on literary skills, in this case by composing acrostics.[54]

The dialogue with Virgil is also visible in an acrostic that Valerius composes at a crucial moment of his narrative in the last book of the poem. The Argonauts are stuck on the island of Peuce, while a sea storm is blocking the pursuit of the Colchians. Juno should stop the war with a decision, but in the meantime, the Argonauts are worried about their fate, and they beg Jason to make a deal with the enemies: they want to keep the Golden Fleece, but at the same time they are ready to send Medea back, in order to put an end to the war:

respiceret pluresque animas maioraque fata
tot comitum, qui non furiis nec amore nefando
Per freta, sed sola sese uirtute sequantur.
An uero ut thalamis raptisque indulgeat unus
Coniugiis? id tempus enim. sat uellera Grais
Et posse *oblata componere uirgine bellum*. (V. Fl. 8.389–394)

[54] Valerius seems to compose a boustrophedon acrostic at 4.398–96. If we start reading from the letter Q of *qualis* (398) and end with the letter T of *sistat*, the sequence spells QASINT (*qua sint*). This would be referred to *qua ualle* and *quo uertice* (396) … *qua sint* "wherever they be." The presence of the acrostic would be signaled at line 395 by *rursus bouis ora recurrit* (alluding to the boustrophedon) and also by *uestigia uisu figit* (394–395), *uertice sistat* (396) and *prima quantum mutata* (398). Lastly, it is probably fortuitous, but if we read the last letters of lines 412 to 403 backwards, the sequence spells EISSANATIO. Shall we read it as *eis sanatio*, or just *sanatio*, or *sanat Io*? Io will eventually become Isis, a goddess who saves.

> Let him regard the more numerous lives, the nobler destinies of so many comrades who are following him over the sea, not through promptings of frenzy or unhallowed desire, but through manliness alone. Or have they come that one only may indulge the joys of wedlock and stolen nuptials? A fitting time, indeed! For the Greeks the Fleece could be enough and to be able to end the war by giving up the maiden.

In order to seal the deal visually, Valerius composes the acrostic PACE, which ends at line 394, where the last name is *bellum*. Again, as we have previously observed concerning the acrostic LANIABOR, the verb *respiceret* (389) draws the attention of the reader to what follows. The acrostic *pace*, at this very moment in the narrative, is certainly not fortuitous. Consider, for instance, that the last line of the acrostic (*oblata componere uirgine bellum*, 394) is inspired by a Virgilian passage: *nec minus interea maternis saeuus in armis / Aeneas acuit Martem et se suscitat ira, /* oblato gaudens componi foedere bellum ("nor less in the meantime, Aeneas, fierce in arms his mother gave him, whets his valor and stirs his heart with wrath, rejoicing that the war is settled by the compact offered," *Aen*. 12.107–109). We note how Valerius reuses *componere bellum* and changes the ablative *oblato foedere* into *oblata uirgine*. In the *Aeneid*, Aeneas rejoices at the opportunity of putting an end to the war between the Rutulians and the Trojans, through a duel between Turnus and himself. Valerius alludes to Virgil but with an inversion of the plot, since in the *Aeneid*, the enemies are ready to sacrifice themselves in order to obtain Lavinia, whereas the Argonauts are ready to sacrifice Medea, in order to avoid a massacre. In both cases, peace is the goal, and the acrostic *pace* seems very appropriate.

Valerius engages also with other famous poets, as is the case with the acrostic ODIA in book 7, which highlights Catullus 85, provided by the oxymoron between *amor* and *odium* at 255:

> occupat amplexu Venus et furialia figit
> **O**scula *permixtumque odiis* inspirat *amorem*
> **D**umque illam uariis maerentem uocibus ambit
> **I**nque alio sermone tenet 'quin hoc' ait 'audi
> **A**tque attolle genas.' lacrimisque haec infit obortis ... (V. Fl. 7.254–258)

> Venus clasps the girl in her embrace, imprinting kisses that drive to frenzy and inspiring love mingled with hatred. And while she soothes her grief with various conversations and occupies her with talk of other things: "Why do you not listen to this," she says, "lift up your face," and thus she begins amidst her sobs ...

As we have seen so far, Valerius is at ease with several types of acrostics, from boustrophedon to Greek, from regular acrostics to reversed ones, as well as

telestichs. In the *Argonautica* we also find the so-called gamma acrostics,[55] and some interesting variations thereof. One, with *polyptoton*, occurs in book 6. The acrostic is ANNI, and is signaled by *alium* … *aspicis annum*:

tu qui faciles hominumque putasti
has, Argiue, domos, *alium* hic miser *aspicis* **annum**
Altricemque niuem festinaque taedia uitae.
Non nos aut levibus *componere* bracchia remis
Nouimus aut uentos opus exspectare ferentes:
Imus equis qua uel medio riget aequore pontus
uel tumida fremit Hister aqua … (V. Fl. 6.323–329)

Argive, you who thought these to be the kindly homes of men, other seasons, poor fool, you behold here, snows for our rearing and early weariness of life. We have not learned to apply our arms to the nimble oar, nor do we need to wait for winds to bear us onward; on horses we ride, be it where the sea lies stiff in mid-expanse or where the swelling waves of Hister roar …

Another interesting variation is found in book 5:

tunc ordine regi
proximus et frater materno sanguine Perses
increpitare uirum, *sequitur duce* turba *reperto*.
Ille furens ira solio se proripit alto
Praecipitatque patres *ipsumque* ut talibus ausis
***S**pem* sibi iam rerum uulgi leuitate serentem
Ense petit. rapit inde fugam crudelia *Perses*
signa gerens omnemque quatit rumoribus Arcton. (V. Fl. 5.265–272)

Then Perses, next in rank to the king and blood brother on his mother's side, assails him with reproach: the crowd, finding a leader, lend support. But he in furious rage starts from his lofty seat and sends the fathers flying headlong; rather against Perses himself he rushes with the sword, as by such ventures he boldly sows for himself hopes of power, thanks to the mob's favor. Perses flees from the place, with marks of cruelty upon him and with rumors stirs up all the North.

In this decisive passage, when the civil war in Colchis is about to begin, Valerius plays with personal pronouns, such as *ille*, and the acrostic IPSE, which points to Perses. *Ipse* is echoed by *ipsumque* (269), but I would also take the phrases *sequitur duce … reperto* (267) and *Perses signa gerens* (271–272) as pointers to the presence of an acrostic. Let me also note that if we put together the words that spell the acrostic IPSE, we can compose

---

55 Besides the one already discussed at 2.367–371 (ET QVI) other (intentional?) gamma acrostics can be found, for instance, at 5.596–599 (HINC) and 5.609–612 (QVAE).

the sentence *ille praecipitat spem ense*, which fits the context well, since we know that even if Perses is the first one to attack his brother (5.265–267), he has previously tried a diplomatic solution to the conflict (cf. 6.18–20), but Aeetes (*ille*) now destroys every hope by the use of violence (*praecipitat spem ense*).[56]

An acrostic can also be a sophisticated and elegant way to allude to episodes that are not explicitly mentioned in the narrative. A fine example can be found in book 7. Jason and Medea meet at night near Hecate's temple. Jason asks Medea why he has been treated so badly in Colchis: *nec pater ille tuus tantis me opponere monstris / (quid meritum?) aut tales uoluit ⟨ex⟩pendere poenas. / an iacet externa quod nunc mihi cuspide Canthus / quodque* meus uestris cecidit pro moenibus Iphis ("Your father would not have me grapple with monsters so dire? What have I deserved? Is it that my Canthus now has fallen by a foreign spear? Or that my Iphis has been slain in battle for your city?" 7.420–423,). Valerius recounts Canthus' death in book 6 (317–370), but Iphis' death, which had been prophesied in the first book, is to be found nowhere in the poem. Some scholars use this passage as evidence that the poem was never finished by Valerius,[57] while others suggest a *lacuna*[58] or argue that Valerius has no real need to recount the episode.[59] And yet, as I believe, the poet does indeed mention Iphis' death, but in a very subtle way, by means of an acrostic:

> **O**buius ut sera cum se sub nocte magistris
> **I**mpingit pecorique pauor qualesue profundum
> **P**er *chaos occurrunt caecae sine uocibus umbrae*,
> **H**aud secus in mediis noctis nemoris⟨que⟩ tenebris
> **I**nciderant ambo attoniti iuxtaque subibant
> abietibus tacitis aut immotis cyparissis
> adsimiles, rapidus nondum quas miscuit Auster. (V. Fl. 7.400–406)

> As when in the deep of night panic fear comes with full shock on herd and herdsman, or as when sightless, voiceless ghosts meet in the abyss of hell, so in the midnight shadows of the grove did the two meet and draw near each other, awe-struck, like silent firs or motionless cypresses when the mad South wind has not yet intertwined their boughs.

During Jason and Medea's meeting, two similes enhance the atmosphere of anxiety, fear and silence.[60] It is in such a gloomy context that Valerius

56 For the *iunctura precipitare spem*, cf. Ov. *Pont.* 3.1.140.
57 See, e.g., Perutelli (1997) 370.
58 See the discussion in Liberman (2002) 319 n. 218.
59 See, e.g., Spaltenstein (2005) 322 and Zissos (2008) 282.
60 See Perutelli (1997) 358.

composes the acrostic O IPHI ("Oh, Iphis!"), which is a genuine pathetic apostrophe to the Argonautic hero Iphis, whose death will be explicitly mentioned a few lines below in the narrative. In the central line of the acrostic (where the poet often conceals the most significant words), in verse 402, we read *per chaos occurrunt caecae sine uocibus umbrae*, where *chaos* means "Underworld" (cf. *TLL* 3.991) and *caecae* "obscure" (cf. *TLL* 3.44, 80), words that render the evocation even more suggestive. Indeed, Iphis is by now among the shadows of the Underworld, and he can no longer be seen or heard. Hecate's woods are an appropriate place for such an evocation, and the vocative, *O Iphi*, grants genuine affection and poetic elegance. It seems that we can feel Iphis' shadow just before learning that he is actually dead.

Valerius has certainly composed many other acrostics,[61] some of which are still waiting to be discovered, while others will never be, because of the textual transmission of the poem. The occurrences discussed here provide good examples of Valerius' sophisticated artistic skills and demonstrate that the influence of Aratus and the Aratean tradition is largely noticeable in the *Argonautica*. And it is no surprise, since Aratus' presence is well attested also in Valerius' main sources, namely Apollonius[62] and Virgil. In addition, the Argonautic myth embeds several astrological aspects, which were certainly well known to the Flavian poet. It would be tempting to establish a connection between Valerius' presumed affiliation to the *quindecimuiri sacris faciundis* and his wide use of acrostics,[63] but all the occurrences found in the *Argonautica* only confirm that acrostics were commonly used in ancient Greek as well as Latin literature. Aratus establishes a connection between letters and stars, words and constellations.[64] From the very beginning of the *Phaenomena*, we learn that, on a textual scale, an acrostic is a *paradeigma* of what Zeus has concealed in the sky. Men need to follow the signs in the sky, in order to recognize the constellations, which are composed of stars. In the same way, the readers have to follow the signs embedded by the poet in his text, in order to find a word (the acrostic) which is composed of letters. This *paradeigma* rapidly becomes a literary tool which can be used to

---

61 I discuss some other occurrences in Castelletti (2008).

62 The use of acrostics is well attested in Apollonius; see, e.g., Danielewicz (2005) and Stewart (2010).

63 During the imperial period, the *quindecimuiri sacris faciundis* were priests of Apollo (Plu. *Cat. Mi.* 4; Liv. 10.8.2), in charge of the Sibylline books, which were composed in acrostics, as witnessed by Cic. *Diu.* 2.111–112.

64 On this aspect, see also Volk (2012) 226–227.

express concepts in an embedded, witty, and elegant way. Like many of his fellow poets, Valerius learns how to master this technique. His poem still has a lot to reveal: we just need to follow the signs and … strive for the stars.

COLLECTIVE SPEECH AND SILENCE IN THE *ARGONAUTICA* OF APOLLONIUS AND VALERIUS[*]

Simone Finkmann

1. *Introduction*

The scope of Apollonius Rhodius' influence on Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* regarding its subject matter, character portrayal, and narrative technique has been scrutinized in many recent studies. The use of direct speech, however, a key feature of Greco-Roman epic poetry, has not been comprehensively examined yet. While Rolf Ibscher's *Gestalt der Szene und Form der Rede in den Argonautika des Apollonios Rhodios* (1939) provides a detailed survey of the speech scenes and the individual direct speeches of the Hellenistic *Argonautica*, the most extensive discussion of the speeches in Valerius' poem remains Ulrich Eigler's *Monologische Redeformen bei Valerius Flaccus* (1988).

This paper analyzes the key similarities and differences in the use of collective and representative speeches and collective "conversational silence"[1] in both Argonautic poems. The collective speeches will be divided into primary (the protagonists) and secondary (other collectives) speeches to facilitate the discussion and avoid unnecessary repetition. For the purposes of our study, a collective speech act is defined as "the coordinated effort of more than one individual in forming utterances in the same rule-governed form of behavior as the speech acts of individuals. The group speech act differs from the individual's monologic utterance only (or at least characteristically) in that its meaning and intention originate in multiple persons."[2]

[*] I would like to thank the editor of this volume, the conference participants, as well as Matthew Leigh, Stephen Heyworth, and the anonymous reviewer for their valuable comments.

[1] Bilmes (1994) 79 defines conversational silence as "the absence of talk (or of particular kinds of talk) where talk might relevantly occur." On the different functions of silence, cf. Ephratt (2008) 1909–1938. On silence in the *Argonautica*, see Nishimura-Jensen (1998) 456–469 and Anzinger (2007) 156–232.

[2] Hughes (1984) 379.

According to this definition, Apollonius employs three primary (A. R. 2.145–153, 4.1251–1258, 4.1458–1460) and three secondary collective speeches (1.242–246, 1.251–259, 4.1318–1329), while Valerius' *Argonautica* includes three secondary (V. Fl. 2.113–114, 3.45, 6.29), and four primary collective speeches (1.627–632, 4.327–329, 5.17–20, 5.550–552).[3] As none of the secondary collective speeches have equivalents in the other epic, they will be discussed separately first before the corresponding primary collective speeches of both epics are analyzed together.

2. *Secondary Collective Speeches in Apollonius*

a. *Male and Female Collectives* (A. R. 1.242–246 and 1.251–259)

When the Argonauts prepare for their departure from Iolcus (A. R. 1.234–258), a crowd of common people (λαῶν / πληθύς, 1.238–239) gathers to see them off.[4] Apollonius first gives a rational evaluation of the Argonauts' mission[5] from the collective male perspective (1.241, 247) before presenting the more emotional female view (1.247).[6]

The men question Pelias' motive for sending their best men on a highly dangerous quest. They are confident that the Argonauts can defeat Aeetes, but are pessimistic about the feasibility of the sea voyage (1.242–246). In contrast to the men, who analyze the reason for the Argonauts' journey and their chances of survival, the women lament the emotional strain the expedition causes for Jason's weak elderly father Aeson (1.251–259) and especially his esteemed mother Alcimede (1.251, 259). While the men accept the mission as a necessity and focus on its future implications, the women dwell on the past and retrospectively curse Phrixus (1.256–259).[7] Their pathos sets the tone for a private farewell between Jason and his parents that takes

---

[3] For a discussion of primary and secondary choruses in Apollonius, see Nishimura-Jensen (2009) 1–23. On the relationship of the chorus and collective speeches, cf. Hentze (1905) 254–268; on τις-speeches (representative speeches), see De Jong (1987) 69–84.

[4] On the different models of Apollonius' farewell scene, see Clauss (1993) 37–56 and Dräger (1995) 474.

[5] On the structure of the scene and the speeches, see Ibscher (1939) 1–6 and Dräger (1995) 472–476.

[6] Cf. Beye (1982) 81: "the agora mentality of the men" and "the thalamus mentality of the women."

[7] Cf. Hurst (1967) 51: "futur, assurance" and "passé-causalité, malheur." These categories apply to both the collective and the individual pair (men-women, Jason-Alcimede).

place indoors. Like the crowd at the shore, servants and maids have gathered inside the house (1.261). The male servants silently carry Jason's armor to the ship, and the maids cry with Alcimede, who wails more profusely than all the female servants (1.262–277). Her excessive lament is effectively contrasted with Aeson's groans and quiet suffering (1.263–264).[8]

Alcimede's farewell speech (1.278–291) mirrors and echoes that of the female collective (1.284–289).[9] The merciful death they wish upon Jason's old, fragile father in order to spare him the pain of losing his son (1.253–255), Alcimede also desires for herself (1.278–283) out of fear of complete social isolation (1.284–289). Like the female collective she ends her speech with a reference to Phrixus to illustrate that she is unprepared for this tragedy (1.290–291).[10]

Analogous to the male collective, Jason responds to his emotional mother in a calm and rational manner (1.295–305).[11] He asks her to compose herself and endure what the gods have devised for them and provides Alcimede with potential sources of support (1.295–302). At the end of his speech, Jason even asks his mother not to accompany him to the ship and quickly leaves her behind to join his men (1.306–319).[12]

Valerius' farewell scene[13] occurs at a similar position in the epic, but is treated more extensively (V. Fl. 1.184–349). Valerius transforms Apollonius' separate public and private leave-taking into a double private farewell between Jason and his parents.[14] The first farewell is only a brief summary without direct discourse (1.294–299), but the second scene corresponds to Apollonius' speech pairs.[15] The order of the speeches representing the male and female perspective is reversed in Valerius: Alcimede speaks first (1.320–334), then Aeson (1.336–347).[16] Her lament is also contrasted to that

8 On Aeson's portrayal, cf. Herter (1944–1955) 341; Hurst (1967) 50; Lütjhe (1971) 30–31; Clauss (1993) 54; and Dräger (1995) 474 n. 10, who describes Aeson as a "Primos-Parodie."

9 Cf. Dräger (1995) 474 and Clauss (1993) 54 for further reference.

10 Cf. Dräger (1995) 474. Cf. the Phrixus-argument of Valerius' Alcimede (V. Fl. 1.327–328).

11 Cf. Clauss (1993) 55.

12 Cf. Fuà (1986) 269 and Dräger (1995) 476.

13 On the different models of Valerius' farewell scene, most prominently Apollonius and Evander's farewell to Pallas at *Aen.* 8.558–584, see Dräger (1995) 486 with further references.

14 The farewell situation is different: in Apollonius, Jason and his parents bid farewell away from the common people inside the house; in Valerius, their second conversation takes place at the ship. Cf. Dräger (1995) 476.

15 The order of Alcimede's and Aeson's speeches corresponds to that of the grieving parents, whose lament is only indirectly summarized (1.315–319). Cf. Dräger (1995) 476.

16 On the modelling of Alcimede's (1.320–334) and Aeson's speech (1.335–347) as a reverse presentation of the two halves of Evander's farewell speech (*Aen.* 8.560–583), cf. Mehmel

of the other mothers (1.317–320),[17] but she has greater self-control (1.335) when compared to them (1.315, 316, 317, 318) and her Apollonian counterpart (1.268–277, 292).[18] Similar to Virgil's Evander (*Aen.* 8. 584), Alcimede gradually loses her initial composure. Her fear for Jason (1.322, 325, 328) finally overwhelms Alcimede and leads to her dramatic collapse at the end of her speech (1.348).[19] Swooning is a common element of farewell scenes to illustrate the female *infirmitas animi* in comparison to the men's greater emotional strength and composure, here assigned to her husband (1.335). Unlike Apollonius' Alcimede she does not fear social isolation,[20] but she is horrified at the dangers she envisions for her son (1.329–330).[21] This is also why she hopes that both she and Aeson will be fortunate enough to die (1.326) before receiving news of Jason's death.[22]

While Aeson's silence in Apollonius reflects his physical weakness, Valerius' Aeson, who is primarily modeled on Virgil's Evander, has greater energy and is presented as a strong, courageous family leader who conducts himself with great dignity suitable for a *uir Romanus* and *pater familias*.[23] He is proud that his son is leading the expedition and regrets that he is not young enough to join the Argonauts in their quest for glory (1.336–340).[24] Aeson is also confident that Jason will have surpassed his father's achievements when he returns from Colchis (1.336–347) and unlike Alcimede, who bewails her futile prayers (1.323), Aeson is convinced that his prayers have been heard (1.341–342, 344) and with his optimism raises everyone's spirits (1.335–336).[25] The scene is then concluded with Jason caringly embracing both his parents for the last time (1.348–349). Through the reversed speech order and the focus on the familial farewell scene, Valerius transforms Apollonius' pessimistic public farewell into a hopeful departure and an *exemplum* of familial piety.[26]

(1934) 62; Fuà (1986) 271; and Dräger (1995) 476–478. The same pairing and order of speeches (Alcimede: 1.763–766; Aeson: 1.788–822) occurs before their suicide at the end of book 1.

17 Unlike Virgil, Lucan, and his contemporaries Statius and Silius, Valerius does not employ any direct speeches by female collectives, but always individualizes the lament by focusing on one speaker.

18 Cf. Dräger (1995) 475 for more examples.

19 Cf. Fuà (1986) 271.

20 Cf. Fuà (1986) 271 and Kleywegt (2005) 183.

21 Cf. Dräger (1995) 487.

22 In contrast to Apollonius' Alcimede, who wishes that she could have died when Pelias announced the mission (1.278–282). Cf. Fuà (1986) 269 and Dräger (1995) 479.

23 See Clauss (1993) 40–41 and Green (1997) 205.

24 Cf. Adamietz (1976) 26; Fuà (1986) 268; and Kleywegt (2005) 193–194.

25 Cf. Adamietz (1976) 19; Fuà (1986) 271–272; and Dräger (1995) 476.

26 Cf. Mehmel (1934) 66; Lüthje (1971) 22; and Dräger (1995) 475.

b. *The Libyan Goddesses* (A. R. 4.1318–1329)

The prophecy of the Libyan goddesses is the longest collective speech in Apollonius and the first of the three collective speeches in the Libya episode. When the Argonauts are stranded at the shores of Libya and disperse to die in private, the three Λιβύης τιμήοροι ("guardians of Libya") suddenly appear before Jason and address the terrified leader (A. R. 4.1318–1329).[27] They introduce themselves as guardian spirits of Libya (4.1322–1323), reveal their knowledge of the Argonauts' successful recovery of the Fleece and past trials (4.1319–1321), and urge Jason to stop his idle lament (4.1324). Their mysterious prophecy (4.1325–1329) confuses Jason, who asks the goddesses for their benevolence and explains his inability to interpret their prophecy without the help of his men (4.1333–1335). Jason then quickly summons the other Argonauts (4.1336–1346) and reports the epiphany and the goddesses' words in great detail (4.1347–1360).[28] When the predicted omen appears in the form of a giant horse with a golden mane emerging from the sea (4.1325–1326, 1364–1368), Peleus understands the prophecy and instructs the Argonauts to follow the horse's path and carry the ship through the desert (4.1369–1380).

The three nymphs have widely been recognized as a foil for the Hesperides, whom the Argonauts encounter shortly afterwards (see 4c below). Furthermore, the epiphany in a remote area, the conclusion of the scene with the poet's invocation of the muses (4.1381–1392), the tone and content of the goddesses' speech and Jason's prayer (4.1333, 1335) echo Hesiod's meeting with the muses on Mt. Helicon.[29] Moreover, Jason, who acts as an intermediary when he shares the goddesses' knowledge with the Argonauts, is cast in the role of the poet and the heroes in the role of the audience.[30]

The speech of the divine collective does not have a direct equivalent in Valerius, but it may have inspired another divine prophecy, namely Helle's

---

27 For models of this scene, see Green (1997) 342.

28 Jason reports their words indirectly, but his speech still contains several repeated word clusters.

29 Cf. 4.984: ἵλατε Μοῦσαι ("forgive me, Muses"). The reference to Athena's birth (4.1310–1311) could also be a *Theogony* allusion. Cf. Livrea (1973) 376 and 380. Hunter (1993) 126 suggests the *Odyssey*'s sirens as model (Hom. *Od*. 12.189–190). Cf. Albis (1996) 110 n. 48: "Such a conflation of models would be typically Alexandrian, and it also would be typically Apollonian to allude to both the beneficial and the destructive aspects of poetry."

30 The (un)veiling of Jason's face (4.1313–1314) is a metaphor for "poetic composition", cf. Albis (1996) 110. See also Livrea (1973) 372 and Rose (1985) 29–44.

epiphany to the Argonauts (V. Fl. 2.592–600).[31] Just as Apollonius' chthonic goddesses are guardian spirits representing the Libyan land, Helle embodies the homonymous Hellespont (2.587–589, 629). Her surfacing from the water with a golden scepter and her association with Thetis (2.589–590) may indicate a conflation of the Libyan horse-omen and Thetis' epiphany, in which she advises Peleus on a successful return-strategy (A. R. 4.854–855).[32] The context of the epiphany is naturally closer to Thetis'; Helle's speech to Jason, however, resembles that of the Libyan nymphs more closely. Like the three goddesses, Helle is sympathetic to the Argonauts' trials and encourages them to continue their journey (V. Fl. 2.592–596). While the Argonauts are facing their last endurance test in Libya, Helle's encouraging prophecy takes place at the beginning of their quest before their first collective fight against the Cyzicans (2.596).

In comparison to the nymphs' enigmatic advice, Helle gives the Argonauts concrete local directions (2.597–599) and instructions for a successful continuation of their journey (2.599–600). She asks Jason to pay tribute to her late brother's grave in Colchis and to deliver her message, which she conveys in an epitaph-like verbatim dictation addressed to Phrixus himself (2.601–612).[33] As in Apollonius, Jason responds with a reverent plea for the goddess' benevolence before he carries out the instructions. The delivery of the divine message is, however, not only postponed for several books, but even omitted in Jason's visit to Phrixus' grave (5.194–213).[34] This omission is representative of Valerius' general tendency to avoid repetition and his "syncopated narration" technique in messenger scenes in particular,[35] which strongly contrasts Apollonius' speech representation with the twofold delivery and repetition of the prophecy in Jason's detailed report and Peleus' interpretation.

---

31 The closest parallel in Roman epic is the prophecy of the *Penates* at Virg. *Aen.* 3.154–171. Cf. Polleichtner (2005) 73.

32 Cf. Albis (1996) 110 n. 47. See also Hylas' apparition to Hercules (V. Fl. 4.25–53), Aeetes' dream vision of Phrixus (5.233–240), and Cretheus' necromantic prophecy (1.741–751). For further models, see Smith (1987) 247 and Poortvliet (1991) 297.

33 Cf. Smith (1987) 254 and Laird (1992) 169–170.

34 Cf. Lüthje (1971) 196 and Wijsman (1996) 111.

35 See the detailed discussion in Laird (1992) 169.

3. *Secondary Collective Speeches in Valerius*

Valerius' three direct speeches by secondary collectives (V. Fl. 2.113–114, 3.45, and 6.29) are on average shorter than the protagonists' collective speeches and are all employed in a divine intrigue.[36] These brief, agitated exclamations[37] are the first of many speeches in the three major fighting scenes of the *Argonautica*: the Lemnian homicide (2.107–142), the Cyzican *nyctomachia* (3.18–261), and the Argonauts' confrontation with Perses' troops in Colchis (6.1–426). The shared context—the arrival of an alien(ated) male collective from the sea—is conceptual and a prerequisite for the deceit: the estranged Lemnian men return home to their wives after successfully fighting the Thracians on the mainland (2.107–113); the Argonauts accidentally return to their Cyzican host after Cybele redirects their unpiloted ship (3.32–42); and Perses wants to form an alliance with the Argonauts, whom he has not met since they first arrived in Colchis (5.177–216, 6.8–17). Despite these existing or intended bonds and their friendly demeanor,[38] the Lemnian men, the Cyzicans, and Perses' troops become erroneously subjected to gruesome slaughter that nearly leads to their complete elimination. A vengeful deity whose hatred they recently incurred through a committed or intended sacrilegious deed initiates this unwarranted tragic bloodshed.[39] Venus is angry because the Lemnians leave her altars unattended after Vulcan's revelation of her affair with Mars (2.98–102);[40] when hunting, Cyzicus slays and provocatively hangs Cybele's lion from his doorpost (3.20–26); and Perses wants to help the Argonauts remove the Fleece from Mars' shrine (5.624–648, 6.18–20). Even though all three speeches are directed at a collective and given from a collective viewpoint, only the speech of the Lemnian men is an actual collective speech. Pan's[41] and Mars' speeches are nonetheless counted among

---

36 Cf. Smith (1987); Poortvliet (1991); Manuwald (1999); and Wijsman (2000) 27–28.

37 All speeches are introduced by speech formulae that start in the middle of the previous line and consist of the speaker's location in the ablative and a noun or verb of speech that indicates great volume (2.112, 3.44, 6.28–29). In all three instances a description of the speech's immense impact replaces the speech concluding formula.

38 The Lemnian men bring gifts (2.113–114), the Cyzicans are generous hosts (2.62–3.13), and Perses is expelled by Aeetes, because he wants to hand over the Fleece to Jason (5.624–648).

39 All scenes are the result of a divine power struggle: Venus-Mars, Cybele-Jupiter, and Mars-Pallas / Jupiter. Cf. Lüthje (1971) 232–236; Adamietz (1976) 81–82; and Manuwald (1999) 43.

40 On the construction of guilt, see Vessey (1985) 328.

41 On the discussion of the speaker's identity, see Happle (1957) 98; Schenk (1999a) 143; Manuwald (1999) 48; and Sauer (2011) 168.

the collective speeches because they try and manage to imitate a collective speaker so well that the addressees in fact believe the speaker to be a trustworthy representative of their in-group.

While the gods' revenge is premeditated (2.101–106, 3.27–31, 6.1–7), their actual crime is opportunistic and based on information that is revealed in the speech acts of their targets. After finding this information, the deities then use it to their advantage and reproduce it in a diametrically opposed statement. The Lemnians' speech forms the first step (the direct speech that inspires the revenge plan), whereas Pan's and Mars' speeches are step two (the verbal misrepresentation of the assumed speakers' opinion).

Venus, like her male counterparts, in her second step, assumes mortal identity and misrepresents the Lemnian men's intention. She finds an opportunity (2.107) when the Lemnian men announce their return with Thracian maids as presents for their anxiously waiting wives (2.113–114).[42] Venus enlists Fama's help to convince the Lemnian women that the supposed maids are in fact Thracian concubines (2.131–132).[43]

As the key to her plan's success, Cybele uses the Cyzicans' constant fear of a Pelasgian night-attack, which Cyzicus (2.656–658) discusses with Jason (2.659–662) during the banquet scene. Protected by darkness (3.32), she makes Pan spread panic among the Cyzicans by declaring falsely the Argonauts' arrival to be another Pelasgian attack (*hostis habet portus, soliti rediere Pelasgi!* "the enemy have seized the harbor, our old foes, the Pelasgians have returned!" 3.45). Pan's highly referential exclamation contains echoes and verbatim repetitions of both Cyzicus' and Jason's speeches:[44] *soliti* echoes Jason's *solitis … furtis* ("with their usual craft," 2.660); *Pelasgi* recalls both *Pelasgum* (2.657) and *Pelagos* (2.659) in the same metrical position; and the emphatic front position of *hostis*, which is a mixture of Cyzicus' end-positioned *hostis* (2.656) and Jason's front-positioned *arma … / hospita* ("guests in arms," 2.661–662), highlights the wordplay and reveals that Jason's wish to make it the Cyzicans' last battle is tragically fulfilled.[45] Valerius plays on Pan's misidentification when he, too, reinterprets the term "Pelasgians" (Cyzicus' enemies: 2.657, 659; 3.45, 126, 221) and subsequently

---

42 On the problematic speech context, see Vessey (1985) 329.

43 In addition to the verbal echoes of both Venus' speech and Fama's delivery (3.142–160), their speeches close with ironic self-references (2.158–160, 184).

44 See Poortvliet (1991) 322–323 and Manuwald (1999) 48–49 for a detailed discussion of the echoes.

45 Cf. Manuwald (1999) 49 n. 73 for further references.

employs it for the Argonauts as original inhabitants of Greece (4.352, 5.116, 5.474, 5.682).[46]

Mars' restlessness leads him back to the camp at night (6.13), which allows him to intervene just in time to prevent Perses from sending an embassy to the Argonauts to disclose Aeetes' true intentions and form an alliance with them. Perses' thoughts, which are reported in *oratio recta*, highlight the dramatic irony of the situation. Perses cannot believe that his brother has tricked Jason into fighting the one person who supports his request. As a result of the inherent irony in Perses' words and the diametrically opposed message Mars distributes, his speech does not contain any echoes or repeated word clusters.

The three secondary collective speeches have a great impact on the narrative plot. The divine interference leads to a significant set back in the Argonauts' quest for the Golden Fleece. The heroes linger on Lemnos to help the women repopulate the island (2.369–373); after the murder of their dear host Cyzicus they are in complete shock and can only continue their journey after a purification ritual (3.362–461); and in Colchis they fight the one person who intended to give them the Fleece (6.18–20).

A comparison between Valerius' secondary collective speeches and Apollonius' account shows that the three short and seemingly insignificant direct speeches in fact serve to mark and draw attention to Valerius' deviation from his Hellenistic model. In the Lemnian speech Valerius highlights that his version does not presume adulterous intentions on the part of the Lemnian men (A. R. 1.611–614) and makes the murder of the innocent husbands more tragic;[47] unlike the Hellenistic *nyctomachia* Valerius' fight does not have a natural cause (A. R. 1.1015–1018: changing winds)[48] and the misidentification is not the result of an honest human mistake (A. R. 1.1021–1024). Instead Valerius invents a divine intrigue that only claims Cyzican lives and leads to a trauma-like lethargy among the Argonauts.[49] Finally, the opportunity for an alliance with Perses and therefore an easy way to recover the Golden Fleece does not exist in Apollonius.[50]

[46] Cf. Poortvliet (1991) 322.
[47] Cf. George (1972) 48; Vessey (1973) 172; Poortvliet (1991) 91; and Berkowitz (2003) 43–46.
[48] Cf. Manuwald (1999) 108 and Sauer (2011) 151–195.
[49] Cf. Manuwald (1999) 114–115.
[50] Cf. Wisjman (1996) 142 and Schenk (1999a) 91–92.

4. *Primary Collective Speeches in Apollonius and Valerius*

a. *Storm Scene Lament* (A. R. 4.1251–1258 and V. Fl. 1.627–632)

When the Argo becomes stranded on the desert coast of Libya on their homeward journey, the heroes are completely disoriented (A. R. 4.1250–1251) and fear for their lives.[51] In their despair they turn to each other for advice (4.1250).[52] They are ashamed to die an ignoble death after they cowardly avoided a second passage through the Symplegades (4.1252–1254)[53] and conclude that it would have been more honorable (4.1255) to have died while attempting something great (4.1255). Ancaeus feels compelled to speak (4.1261–1276), even though he is just as helpless as his comrades (4.1259). The steersman "makes a conscious decision to abdicate his navigational responsibilities"[54] and asks that somebody else devise an escape plan (4.1273–1274). His despondence takes away all the Argonauts' hope to continue their journey by sea (4.1261–1276).[55]

Valerius' Argonauts face a similar situation of helplessness (V. Fl. 1.598–617), when they are caught in a storm during their first night at sea (1.574–692).[56] While Virgil's storm scene (*Aen.* 1.50–156) has widely been recognized as Valerius' main model and its similarities to Homer (*Od.* 5.282–450), Ovid (*Met.* 11.474–572), and Lucan (5.560–677) have been discussed in great detail, Apollonius' influence has been either neglected or entirely denied despite striking parallels.[57] In both scenes, the Argonauts are entrapped by hostile winds (in A. R. 4.1250 on a sandbank, in V. Fl. 1.598–607 at sea), fear for their lives (in A. R. 4.1250 and 1259 by dehydration, in V. Fl. 1.621, 626, 632 by drowning),[58] and are finally saved through divine benevolence (in A. R. 4.1318–1329 by the prophecy of the Libyan goddesses, in V. Fl. 1.641–658 by

---

51 On this episode, see Delage (1930) 253–261; Livrea (1973) 137–156; Elliger (1975) 312–331; Dufner (1988) 189–195; Williams (1991) 163–173; and Clare (2002) 150–153.

52 On the speech and the echoes of Hector's (Hom. *Il.* 22.304–305) and Odysseus' words (*Od.* 13.200–216), see Garson (1972) 6; Hutchinson (1988) 104; and Williams (1991) 169–170.

53 On the Homeric model (*Od.* 9.76–84), see Hutchinson (1988) 104; Knight (1995) 125; and Clare (2002) 150.

54 Clare (2002) 153.

55 Cf. Polleichtner (2005) 72 n. 399: "(t)he desperate situation is highlighted by the fact that Ancaius is the speaker who raised low spirits in AR 2.851–858." See also Green (1997) 340.

56 For a more detailed discussion of the sea storm scene, see Lüthje (1971) 35–40; Shelton (1974); Adamietz (1976) 21–24; Burck (1978) 9–14; and Zissos (2006a) 79–95.

57 Cf. Shelton (1974) 22 and Hutchinson (1993) 89 n. 23. Polleichtner (2005) 60–83 discusses Apollonius' influence on Virgil's storm scene.

58 The sound *murmur* is indicative of inarticulate or indistinct voices and is commonly employed for collectives; cf. V. Fl. 1.626 and Galimberti Biffino (2008) 212–213.

Neptune's settling of the sea). In both cases, the heroes' fear and frustration with themselves stems from their ignorance.[59] Apollonius' Argonauts are unaware that the Clashing Rocks became immobile after they first passed them; they falsely believe they could have altered their course against Zeus' plans (4.1275–1276); and their lack of knowledge about Libya increases their fear (A. R. 4.1250–1256).[60] The Roman Argonauts are unaware (V. Fl. 1.625–626) both of Jupiter's approbation of their voyage (1.531–567) and Boreas' rebellion against it (1.598–607). They consider the sea storm a natural phenomenon and strongly believe that the sea is punishing them for disturbing the previously un-navigated sacred waters (1.625–632).[61] The main reason for the Argonauts' despair in Valerius, as in Apollonius, is not fear of death, but of a dishonorable death (1.632) before they have even properly started their heroic quest.[62] Therefore, despite their timid portrayal, in both cases the heroes are characterized as hungry for glory, even in a life-threatening situation.

The Apollonian model would also explain why Valerius' sea storm, unlike that of his Roman predecessors and contemporaries, features a speech by a collective and not the epic's (individual) protagonist.[63] In Apollonius, the collective speech marks the Argonauts' final trial at the end of their voyage. The Argonauts' trip is forcefully brought to a halt, their steersman Ancaeus resigns his position, and they have no choice but to continue their journey through the vast Libyan mainland (A. R. 4.1258). In Valerius, the storm constitutes the heroes' first endurance test as a collective,[64] and by addressing all men on land (V. Fl. 1.631) and warning them to refrain from seafaring, the heroes emerge as pioneers of navigation and Tiphys as skillful first steersman.[65]

Moreover, Valerius' speech scene characterizes Hercules, whose strength and comradeship is the topic of two of Apollonius' collective speeches. Having reduced Hercules' importance by not having the Argonauts offer

---

[59] Shelton (1974) 15 identifies *ignari* (1.626) as "the key word" of Valerius' episode.

[60] Cf. Polleichtner (2005) 64.

[61] On the religious terminology, see Shelton (1974) 17 and Kleywegt (2005) 374.

[62] Note the Argonauts' early reference to the Clashing Rocks in their speech (V. Fl. 1.630). In 8.178–194, Erginus urges Jason to take a different course on their return voyage by reminding him of how even the great Tiphys struggled with the passage through the Symplegades.

[63] Cf. Polleichtner (2005) 64: "In the *Aeneid* as well as in the *Odyssey* these storms are weather catastrophes for the main hero." On the speech, cf. Eigler (1988) 19–23; Kleywegt (2005); Galli (2007a); and Zissos (2008).

[64] Cf. Shelton (1974) 21 and Burck (1978) 9.

[65] Cf. Shelton (1974) 16–17.

Hercules the leadership of the quest as the most suitable leader (A. R. 1.341–343), Valerius now in the Argonauts' first trial also shows Hercules' strength to be useless (V. Fl. 1.634). The silent helplessness of the bravest hero (1.634) not only stresses the severity of the situation and their collective dependence on divine benevolence,[66] but also emphasizes Hercules' isolation from the group (1.635–637) in comparison to the collective approval (1.681–682) of Jason and trusting, silent obedience to Tiphys' instructions (1.689).[67]

b. *Post-Fight Celebrations in Bebrycia* (A. R. 2.145–153 and V. Fl. 4.327–329)

Both epicists employ a collective speech in the Bebrycian episode, which constitutes the Argonauts' first task after their loss of Heracles / Hercules.[68] In both versions, the direct speeches are instrumental in establishing the reason for the Argonauts' murder of Amycus, their desire to punish the barbaric tyrant for his hubris and impiety towards Jupiter. Attention is drawn to them by elaborate word plays, which find their greatest emphasis in the respective collective speeches. In Apollonius the world plays are aimed at Amycus' outrageous law (A. R. 2.5), while in Valerius they revolve around the two fighters' divine parentage.[69]

In his opening speech (A. R. 2.11–18), Amycus declares that by his decree (2.12, 17) all foreigners must fight against him and challenges the best of the Argonauts to a boxing duel (2.15–18). Amycus' demands enrage the Argonauts, in particular Polydeuces (2.19–24), who volunteers to fight him pursuant to his outrageous law (2.23).[70] Polydeuces does not respond to Amycus' taunting (2.55–62) and simply goes on to kill the king (2.63–97), upon which the Bebrycians attack the Argonauts to seek revenge, but are easily defeated by them again (2.98–144). In this situation, one of the Argonauts raises his voice and addresses the group in a *secum*-speech (2.144).[71] His speech (2.145–153) illustrates that Amycus' death is a punishment for his hubris and insolent laws (2.148, 150).[72] The speaker then hypothesizes

66 Cf. Kleywegt (2005) 376 with further references.

67 Cf. Adamietz (1970) 30–31 and Eigler (1988) 22.

68 On Apollonius, see Ibscher (1939) 31–33; Hagopian (1955); Köhnken (1965); Rose (1984) 115–135; Cuypers (1997); and Leigh (2010).

69 Cf. Shelton (1984) 18–23 and Zissos (2008) 73.

70 Cf. Ibscher (1939) 32; Fränkel (1968) 155; Green (1997) 233; and Polleichtner (2005) 226.

71 The speech is the first of two τις-speeches in Apollonius' *Argonautica*, both of which are assigned to anonymous Argonauts. See Cuypers (1997) 170.

72 Cf. Ibscher (1939) 33.

that the Bebrycians would have reacted in an even more cowardly fashion,[73] had the gods allowed Heracles to be with them in Bebrycia (2.146),[74] and concludes that the absent hero would have immediately suppressed Amycus' ridiculous proclamation with his club (2.145–150)[75] and thereby would have prevented the boxing match in the first place (2.147–148). Regretful, the speaker reminds the other Argonauts that it is their own fault that Heracles is not able to protect them anymore, and predicts that each and every one of them would soon come to realize that they made a fatal mistake to leave him behind (2.151–153).[76] After this ambivalent reflection on events, the scene is concluded with a summary of the Argonauts' victory celebration with a sacrificial feast and a hymn to Polydeuces (2.156–168).[77]

The overall outline of Valerius' Bebrycian episode (V. Fl. 4.99–343)[78] is similar to Apollonius'. The episode is, however, longer and contains as many as ten direct speeches. Like its Hellenistic model (A. R. 2.36, 97), it stages the boxing match as a spectacle with the despondent Bebrycians as silent spectators on one and the cheering Argonauts on the other side (V. Fl. 4.292, 297–298).[79] By presenting the Bebrycians as even more cowardly and disloyal than in Apollonius and having them flee without defending their king's corpse (4.315–316),[80] Valerius strengthens the contrast in character between them and the Argonauts and at the same time gives Pollux's individual achievement greater importance (see discussion below).[81]

The Bebrycians' impending doom and the aforementioned play on Amycus' and Pollux's identity in this episode, are first established in Neptune's soliloquy, which bewails the Argonauts' arrival in his son's realm and anticipates Amycus' death (4.118–130). Amycus' own *megalomania* and provocation of Jupiter in his first speech (4.219–220) and his presumptuous loquacity (4.206–221, 240–244, 250–251) are then again contrasted with Pollux's

73 On the Bebrycians' cowardice (2.145), cf. Cuypers (1997) 170 and Zumbo (1975–1976) 474.

74 On Zeus' orders for Heracles, see 1.1315–1320 and 2.154. Cf. also Cuypers (1997) 173.

75 On the sarcastic, generalising plural and repetition, see Köhnken (1965) 97; Vian (1973) 86–87; and Cuypers (1997) 171.

76 For the compatibility of a confession of guilt and the claim of a divinely ordained separation, see Cuypers (1997) 169. Cf. Köhnken (1965) 97 and Levin (1971) 148–149.

77 Cf. Nishimura-Jensen (2009) 14–15.

78 On Valerius' episode, see Mehmel (1934) 41–54; Shey (1968) 116–122; Lüthje (1971) 147–153; Adamietz (1976) 54–58; Korn (1989); Campanini (1996); and Murgatroyd (2009) 75–77.

79 Cf. Murgatroyd (2009) 137 and Nishimura-Jensen (2009) 15.

80 In direct contrast to A. R. 2.98–99. Cf. Korn (1989) 205 and Murgatroyd (2009) 167–168.

81 For Pollux's volunteering, cf. 4.189–190 and 225. Cf. Fränkel (1968) 156 and Shelton (1984) 21.

restrained silence, which highlights the irony of Amycus' disrespect towards him.[82] Until the very end, Amycus does not suspect that the opponent he tried to impress with his boasting is in fact Jupiter's son. Only with his final punches Pollux reveals his identity and retaliates for Amycus' taunting (4.312–314).

It is against this background that the Argonauts' collective greeting of their victorious comrade (4.327) emerges as a gleeful response to Amycus' boasting (4.213). At the same time it celebrates the Argonauts as mighty sons of gods (1.1) and more importantly Jupiter's agents. Pollux's dedication of his victory to his father (4.343) emphasizes that the death of the barbaric tyrant is a victory for Jupiter's world plan and a "triumph of civilization over barbarism."[83]

Valerius' replacement of the praise of Heracles with a hymn to Pollux (4.327–329)[84] draws attention to the different evaluation of the Argonauts' first trial in Heracles / Hercules' absence. While Apollonius' speaker stresses that despite the fortunate outcome of the fight, Heracles' presence would have prevented the bloodshed altogether and anticipates their demise without Heracles' protection, Pollux's victory and celebration in Valerius show that Hercules is replaceable and hence forgotten here. However, even though Hercules is not mentioned explicitly, the collective speech contains several intra- and intertextual allusions to the hero. The praise of Pollux's excellent boxing education (*o magnanimis memoranda palaestris / Taygeta et primi felix labor ille magistri!* "Oh Taygetus, renowned for great-hearted wrestling-schools and for the fruitful lessons of your earliest teacher!" 4.328–329) contains the common Herculean epithet *magnanimus* and echoes his labors. More importantly, Pollux's greeting contains a clear allusion to the chorus of Virgil's Salian priests (*Aen.* 8.285–302), which praises Hercules' defeat of Cacus and portrays him as the archetypical slayer of monsters and law enforcer, and thus, the ideal person for the task in Bebrycia.[85] The striking reduplication of the Salian greeting (*salue, uera Iouis proles*, "hail, true offspring of Jupiter," *Aen.* 8.301) in the Argonauts' praise of Pollux (*salue, uera Iouis, uera o Iouis … proles*, "hail, true offspring, indeed true

[82] Cf. 4.240 and 243.

[83] Murgatroyd (2009) 169. Cf. 4.317. See also Lüthje (1971) 152–153; Shelton (1984) 21; and Korn (1989) 84.

[84] The collective speech and its introduction are evidently inspired by Polydeuces' hymn in A. R. 2.155–163.

[85] Cf. Amycus' portrayal in 4.188 and 200.

offspring of Jupiter," 4.327) suggests, however, that Pollux has not only surpassed Amycus through his victory, but also Hercules.[86]

c. *Collective Lament* (A. R. 4.1458–1460 and V. Fl. 5.17–20)

Only twelve days after Jason's meeting with the Libyan goddesses (see 2b above), the Argonauts arrive at Lake Triton, where they encounter the Hesperides (A. R. 4.1380–1384).[87] Unlike the Λιβύης τιμήοροι (4.1318–1329), they only reluctantly help the Argonauts after Orpheus pleads with them (4.1411–1421).[88] Aegle finally reveals that Heracles recently came to their garden as part of his labors, slew the serpent guarding the golden apples, and miraculously created a water source from a rock to quench his thirst (4.1432–1449). Upon hearing that the spring water that now saves them from an excruciating death by dehydration has been created by Heracles, one of the refreshed and rejoicing Argonauts (4.1457) representatively expresses their gratitude to the absent hero and their hope to be reunited with him on the homeward journey (4.1458–1460). His words even motivate (4.1461) the recovered heroes to start searching for Heracles immediately (4.1461–1464).

Like the Argonauts' first speech, this τις-speech is also dedicated to the memory of the absent Heracles.[89] While Heracles' protection of the Argonauts from Amycus is only hypothetical (see 2b above), he is here celebrated as their actual savior. Heracles' importance becomes even more apparent in comparison to the double death of Canthus (4.1485–1497) and Mopsus (4.1502–1527, 1530–1531) shortly afterwards, which is only briefly summarized and not lamented in a direct speech (4.1498–1501, 4.1527–1528, 4.1532–1536).

A similar situation occurs in Valerius when during the Argonauts' stay in Lycus' realm they eulogize Tiphys as their only hope for survival. Analogous to Heracles, Tiphys' first and final appearance *in propria persona* in Valerius coincides with collective speeches that illustrate the Argonauts'

86 On the Virgilian model, see Adamietz (1976) 58; Korn (1989) 209; and Murgatroyd (2009) 172.

87 The roles are reversed: instead of a female, divine collective (Λιβύης τιμήοροι) and an individual male mortal addressee (Jason), a goddess (Aegle) speaks to a mortal male collective (Argonauts).

88 On allusions to the Libyan goddesses in Orpheus' speech, cf. Albis (1996) 110 and Korenjak (2000) 240–242.

89 The two speeches contain similar introductory formulae (V. Fl. 2.144 ~ A. R. 4.1457). Both speech conclusions are brief and simple (V. Fl. 2.154 ~ A. R. 4.1461).

reliance on him.[90] When Tiphys suddenly falls sick from a contagious illness (V. Fl. 5.13–16), his critical condition puts the Argonauts in great distress, as they feel that all their lives (5.15) and the safe continuation of their voyage depends solely on the know-how of their helmsman (5.13–15).[91] They pray to Apollo as bringer and healer of plagues (5.17–20), but Tiphys dies shortly afterwards. Both Apollonius and Valerius cast Tiphys in the role of the Argonauts' vigilant helmsman, who competently directs the Argo and serves as a source of strength for the crew. While in Apollonius' version, Tiphys' sudden illness and death are summarized in a few lines (A. R. 2.851–863), Valerius extends the account of Tiphys' demise considerably (V. Fl. 5.13–62) and at the same time shortens the description of Idmon's death (A. R. 2.815–850).[92] He moreover changes his cause of death (V. Fl. 5.2–3) and thus its impact and function.[93] In Valerius, Idmon becomes the first of the Argonauts to die from the infectious disease (5.1–5) and his death serves primarily to heighten the suspense and set the scene for Tiphys' death. While the subsequent funeral rites are prepared for Tiphys and Idmon alike, the Argonauts' tearful collective prayer (5.37–59)[94] and Jason's passionate monologue[95] reveal that they consider Tiphys as the most valuable crewmember. Valerius thus again reduces Hercules' importance for the Argonauts in comparison to

90 For the ring composition of the Tiphys-simile in both collective speech scenes, see Gärtner (1994) 239.

91 Cf. 5.19–20. This is a reversal of the Virgilian model, in which the helmsman has to be sacrificed for the collective safety. See Brenk (1999) 34–59 and extensively Van der Schuur in this volume, pp. 99 and 112.

92 They mourn for three days, bury him with full honors, and even establish a burial mound (A. R. 2.835–850). The scene is laden with pathos and serves as an exemplum of the Argonauts' great respect for Idmon.

93 In the Apollonian version, despite Peleus' and Idas' desperate attempts to save him (A. R. 2.818–831), Idmon is dramatically killed by a wild boar and dies in the arms of his comrades (A. R. 2.832–834). On the reorganization of Apollonius' account, see Schetter (1959) 301; Hershkowitz (1998) 9; Zissos (2004b) 328; and Van der Schuur in this volume, pp. 95–112.

94 Tiphys' death is excessively mourned by the fearful (5.15, 23) and lethargic (5.14, 16, 63) Argonauts. Their lament is compared to that of children who cry for their dying father (5.22–26). Cf. 8.182, where Tiphys' successor Erginus invokes him as *uenerandus pater*. This suggests that Apollo is addressed as divine paternal guardian (5.18) to protect their mortal paternal guardian. On the simile, see Fitch (1976) 113–124; Gärtner (1994) 239; and Wijsman (1996) 27.

95 When Jason voices his anger at the gods for the loss of Hercules, Idmon, and Tiphys (5.40), he only mentions Hercules (5.43) and Idmon (5.42–43) in passing, but emotionally addresses Tiphys in an apostrophe (5.44) and dedicates the rest of his speech to the memory of his helmsman. For a detailed analysis of Jason's speech, see Eigler (1988) 58–64 and Van der Schuur in this volume, pp. 103–104.

Apollonius' model in favor of another prominent crewmember, here for a second time Tiphys (see 2a above).

On an intratextual level, Valerius' collective speech is of far greater significance for the narrative plot than Apollonius'. The fact that the Argonauts' prayer does not identify Tiphys by name, but only mentions him in a periphrasis that describes his double task as helms- and steersman emphasizes that they do not mourn a personal, but a professional loss.[96] The death of the pioneer navigator endangers the continuation of their sea voyage and generates "a technological 'crisis of succession'."[97] The combination of his death with that of the seer Idmon, moreover, highlights its significance "in poetic and metapoetic terms."[98] The death of the pioneer navigator and the "primary metanarrative spokesman"[99] in the middle of the epic effectively concludes the Odyssean half of the epic—"Tiphys on the thematic and Idmon on the programmatic or metanarrative level."[100]

d. *Collective Reaction to Aeetes* (A. R. 3.489–490 and V. Fl. 5.550–552)

The final collective speech of Valerius' Argonauts is their shortest speech and the only one that receives a reply. It is most likely inspired by the indirect collective speech act in Apollonius (A. R. 3.489–490), which is therefore included in this discussion of Valerius' collective speech in the interest of completeness.

After his first audience with Aeetes, Jason sends Castor back to the other Argonauts, who are impatiently awaiting new instructions. Upon seeing him return, they request an immediate report of the events (V. Fl. 5.550–552). The fact that they start shouting as soon as they spot their comrade in the distance (5.549) is one of the few details Valerius keeps from Apollonius' account (A. R. 3.489–490). While the result of the message—the heroes leaving the Argo behind to recover the Golden Fleece in Colchis (V. Fl. 5.558–563 ~ A. R. 3.572–575)–is comparable, the mood and function of the report are diametrically opposed.

---

96 Cf. the transfer of the Argonauts' respect and love for Tiphys to the new helmsman (5.68–69).

97 Zissos (2004b) 330. On the appointment of his successor by the Argo herself (5.65–66), cf. Wijsman (1996) 45.

98 Hershkowitz (1998) 8. Cf. also Fowler (1997) 21 and Zissos (2004b) 328–331.

99 See Zissos (2004b) 328. In Idmon's last mention before his death (4.544–546), Jason declares his seers' prophecies to be no longer sufficient.

100 Zissos (2004b) 331. See also Fowler (1997) 21 and Hershkowitz (1998) 8.

In Valerius, the pessimistic and anxiously waiting Argonauts (V. Fl. 5.548)[101] are provided with good news, whereas Apollonius' hopeful heroes are confronted with a devastating report. These disparate messages reflect the different portrayals of Aeetes. Apollonius' tyrant openly vents his outrage at the Argonauts' request (A. R. 3.405–421), taunts them (3.367–382, 432–438) and challenges them to a terrifying contest (3.396–422), whereas in Valerius he veils his anger, offers Jason the Fleece in return for his military assistance (V. Fl. 5.534–541) and invites him to a banquet (5.567–617). In Apollonius, it is Jason who personally breaks the bitter news to his men (A. R. 3.494–501), who in their shock fall into a long silence (3.502–504). Valerius' Jason sends Castor to report the events and quickly summon the Argonauts (V. Fl. 5.519–569), who are delighted by the alliance and without hesitation follow Jason's instructions (5.558). Castor's message and the Argonauts' quick unquestioning compliance are characteristic of their relationship with Jason. He is the only one who speaks in Valerius' audience scene and makes all the important decisions. Jason's proposal to explore Colchis (5.313–324) and his acceptance of Aeetes' alliance are not subject to discussion, but he makes direct orders (5.555–556), with which the Argonauts uncritically comply.[102] In Apollonius, the entire meeting with Aeetes is a collective endeavor. Jason is the first and last to speak and his proposals are accepted by approving collective silence (A. R. 3.169–170) or unanimous verbal approval (3.194–195, 3.555–556),[103] but everything is collectively discussed before, during, and after the meeting with Aeetes (3.372–474).[104] Jason explicitly addresses the importance of counseling before the meeting, when he urges the Argonauts not to remain silent, but to share their opinion openly (3.174–175). He thanks them for their advice[105] and lets Phrixus' sons address Aeetes first (3.302–316). Jason also highlights the power of expression and the importance of choosing one's words carefully and intervenes with an astute speech (3.384–395) when Telamon loses his compo-

---

101 On Valerius' detailed psychological description of the protagonists, see Wijsman (1996) 243.

102 This is a general tendency: whereas arguments among the Argonauts are frequent in Apollonius, Valerius nearly entirely omits their group discussions with two noteworthy exceptions: their loss of Hercules at Mysia (V. Fl. 3.598–725) and the surrender of Medea to Absyrtus with an important occurrence of epic silence (8.385–407).

103 Cf. Hunter (1989) 151: "a common Homeric pattern of speech–silence–speech."

104 This leads to a repetition of arguments: cf. A. R. 3.483, 537–539, and 572–575.

105 In particular Peleus (3.504–514) and Argus (A. R. 3.317–367, 475–483, 521–540) show initiative and actively participate in the discussion, and Mopsus interprets the divine omen for them (3.540–555).

sure (3.382–384).[106] The other Argonauts follow his example (3.317–367, 424–425, 486–487) and their reaction often seems to mirror Jason's (3.439–442, 422–423, 489–490). They understand each other without words (3.439–442), agree in their disagreement (3.487, 3.556–563, 564–565),[107] compromise if necessary (3.566–572), and are willing to die on behalf of the other Argonauts (3.511–521).

On an intratextual level, Valerius' collective speech is connected to all previous collective speeches by verbal echoes or recurring motifs. While the first collective speech officially transformed the heroes into pioneer navigators and introduced the Odyssean half of the epic, this collective speech, which results in the abandonment of the Argo and the start of the Colchian adventure, opens the Iliadic half. Furthermore, it finally gives the Argonauts the opportunity to fulfill their wish for a glorious death, as expressed in the sea storm (V. Fl. 1.562–563).[108] The choice of Castor, who is not a member of the Apollonian embassy,[109] as messenger and the Argonauts' greeting of him (5.550–551)[110] establish a parallel to the collective celebration of Pollux in Bebrycia. As his twin brother returns to his comrades after having saved them (2.647–648) in his boxing match against Amycus, Castor brings great relief to the Argonauts when he returns to announce that Aeetes' rumored savagery is untrue (3.553). Castor's misinformation, however, prompts the heroes to intervene in an unheroic internal war (6.736) that obstructs the successful completion of their mission.[111]

Finally, the Argonauts' anxiety and pessimism regarding a safe return from their quest (5.551)[112] echoes their despondence when they pray to Apollo to save Tiphys' life for a successful continuation of their journey (5.18–19). In both scenes Jason's instructions help them overcome their anxiety and they do not question or hesitate to comply with his orders (5.60, 558). The Argonauts' request for instructions in the current scene is their last speech as a collective. With the beginning of the Colchian adventure and

106 See Lüthje (1971) 223–226 and Adamietz (1976) 78–79.

107 On the Argonauts' self-consciousness and Idas' objections, see Hunter (1989) 152–153; Fucecchi (1996) 133; and Zissos (1999) 295.

108 Cf. Hunter (1986) 50–60 and Wijsman (1996) 256–257.

109 Castor is one of nine Argonauts chosen by lot (V. Fl. 5.326), as opposed to Telamon, Augeas, and Phrixus' four sons (A. R. 3.176–178); Castor only plays a minor part (A. R. 3.515–520). Cf. Wijsman (1996) 252.

110 See Wijsman (1996) 253 on the use of *alma* for deities. Cf. V. Fl. 4.327 (of Pollux).

111 Cf. Mehmel (1934) 95.

112 Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.137. See also Wijsman (1996) 254.

the focus on the story of Medea and Jason they lose their collective voice and are subsequently represented through Jason.

5. *Conclusion*

Both Apollonius Rhodius (three and three) and Valerius Flaccus (three and four) employ collective speeches very selectively in their poems. These speeches are consistently short speeches, ranging between three and twelve lines in Apollonius and only two thirds to six lines in Valerius. All speeches, except the dialogic prophecy of the Libyan goddesses and the Argonauts' request for a quick message delivery after their audience with Aeetes are *secum*-speeches or monologues with no reply. Both epicists vary their speech formulae and employ representative speeches as well as proper collective speeches.

It is noteworthy that Valerius follows Apollonius in the conflation of literary models in his collective speeches. The most striking example is the Argonauts' speech in Bebrycia, where Valerius uses a Virgilian allusion to comment on Apollonius' chorus.

The collective that speaks most frequently in both epics is naturally the collective of the protagonists, but even the direct speeches by secondary collectives serve to characterize a specific individual Argonaut or the Argonauts as a group. The individual that is most often characterized in a collective speech is Hercules/Heracles, but with different means and effect. In Apollonius, Heracles' importance for the quest is stressed, and his absence is lamented directly by the Argonauts throughout their journey. Valerius, by contrast, only indirectly characterizes their relationship through collective speeches, which emphasize the strength of their homogenous group, as other Argonauts are allowed to take Hercules' place. The only crewmember Valerius' Argonauts consider irreplaceable is their helmsman, in which case the Argo herself elects his successor.

Unlike Apollonius, Valerius does not assign direct speeches to female or divine collectives, but always individualizes female and divine declarations. Similarly, he does not employ more than one collective speech in the same episode, whereas Apollonius' Libyan episode contains three speeches in close proximity.

There are many direct equivalents for Apollonius' individual speeches; however, no single collective speech receives an exact representation in Valerius. For two of Apollonius' collective speeches, a Valerian variation exists as a collective speech with a shared speech topic (loss of an important

crewmember) or shared speech context (storm scene) in a different episode. When the collective speeches occur at a similar position in the same episode (farewell from Iolcus, victory over Amycus, audience with Aeetes) the collective speech is directly reported in one epic, but only summarized in the other. This change of speech representation sometimes results from a shift of focus to different speakers (male and female collective, Aeson and Alcimede) or addressees (Heracles, Pollux).

Valerius' secondary collectives do not have a model in Apollonius, because these speeches serve as intertextual markers that emphasize a deviation from the Hellenistic version.

While there is no corresponding pattern of speech distribution, the speeches of both epics are all inserted at moments that are crucial for the continuation of the Argonauts' journey, constitute great danger to the heroes' lives or delay their journey. The speeches are therefore not only of great significance for the characterization of the Argonauts, but also the narrative plot. This is especially evident in Valerius' poem, where the protagonists' first speech officially transforms them into pioneer navigators, the second speech occurs during their first trial after losing Hercules, the third concludes the Odyssean half with the death of their helmsman, and the fourth speech results in the abandonment of the Argo and opens the Iliadic half of the *Argonautica*.

The most prevalent occurrence of epic silence in collective speech scenes in both epics is a helpless reticence that results from grief, shock, or fear. In the Bebrycian episode the silence of the individual and the collective are chiastically arranged. The silence of the Bebrycians, which reflects their fear and disloyalty to their king, is contrasted to the confidently cheering Argonauts, who enthusiastically support their fighter and celebrate him after the victory. At the same time the Bebrycian king's boastful loquacity is contrasted to Polydeuces' / Pollux's calm and restrained silence, which Valerius works into an amusing play on the fighters' identity. The most frequent and diverse use of collective silence coincides and alternates with the greatest number of direct speeches in Apollonius' Aeetes-audience, where the Argonauts' silence represents despondence, prudent deliberation, unanimous approval, and deep mutual understanding.

CONFLATING FUNERALS: THE DEATHS OF IDMON AND TIPHYS IN VALERIUS' *ARGONAUTICA*[*]

Marco van der Schuur

The second half of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* opens with two deaths. At the end of the fourth book, following their successful passage through the Clashing Rocks, the Argonauts arrive in the kingdom of Lycus on the Black Sea coast. They are welcomed with open arms, but as the next day dawns, disaster strikes: the seer Idmon, and a little later the helmsman Tiphys as well, succumb to a deadly illness and are buried together on Jason's orders (V. Fl. 5.1–62).

As may be expected, Valerius' description of these two deaths on the shore is a reworking of Apollonius' description of the same events (A. R. 2.815–863). But Valerius' rewriting of his Argonautic predecessor is also heavily indebted to several Virgilian deaths and funerals, those of Palinurus and Misenus in particular. Virgil had been inspired by Homeric examples, such as the death and funeral of Elpenor, which also lies behind the death of Idmon as described by Apollonius. In their turn the Apollonian funerals, together with the Homeric ones, had served as a Greek source of inspiration for Virgil.[1]

---

[*] I would like to thank Harm-Jan van Dam, Annette Harder, Philip Hardie, Mark Heerink, and Ruurd Nauta for their comments. Special thanks go to all of those present at the conference for their questions, comments, and good company.

[1] There are plenty of other deaths and funerals in Greek and Latin epic that may be taken into account in an analysis of this Valerian passage. A sample of these parallel funerals is briefly discussed in this note. The original great epic funeral, that of Patroclus in Homer's *Iliad*, is present in the background, as is noted by Wijsman (1996) 19, Liberman (2002) 160–161 and Dräger (2003) 450. Liberman suggests that the mixing of the ashes of Idmon and Tiphys at the end of the passage may be inspired by Patroclus' wish that Achilles' ashes and his own be mixed together (Hom. *Il.* 23.83–84). Thus one may consider these allusions to Patroclus' funeral a return to epic origins (compare Zissos [2002] 87–92), an Iliadic erasure of all of the intertextual mirroring and doubling discussed in this article. In terms of epic plot structure, the theme of funerals at the mid-way point of an epic or of an epic journey is paralleled in Lucan, Statius, and Silius. One may compare the loss of the "helmsman" Pompey in Lucan; the funereal stand-still during the epic games in the sixth book of the *Thebaid*; and finally Hannibal's burying of the Romans in *Punica* 10, like Jason a stranger in a strange land (compare Spaltenstein [2004] 392–393). I thank those present at the Flavian conference in

It is my aim in this article to investigate Valerius' poetic response to this epic tradition of *nostos* deaths and funerals in his description of the deaths and funerals of Idmon and Tiphys. I shall focus on Valerius' intertextual engagement with Virgil and Apollonius in particular, and will situate my interpretation of this passage in the more general debate on Valerius' intertextual technique. In this passage Valerius emerges both as a confident restructurer of, and a sophisticated commentator on, the epic tradition he has inherited. These two roles within the poetic tradition that Valerius creates for himself should not be considered separately—rather, they are closely connected.

1. *Valerius Flaccus between "Roman" and "Argonautic" Epic*

One of the most important topics in scholarship on Valerius' *Argonautica* is the poem's relationship to its two most important predecessors: Virgil's *Aeneid* and Apollonius' *Argonautica*. Generally speaking, two different views on Valerius' intertextual self-positioning between his two most important sources of inspiration have emerged. On the one hand, Valerius has been viewed as an author confidently restructuring the tradition that he has inherited to suit his poetic needs. On the other hand, scholars have argued that the defining characteristic of Valerius' intertextual technique is the constant undermining of a reader's attempts to make final sense of the poet's allusions to poetic predecessors, thereby emphasizing the infinite complexity of the epic tradition. Below follows a necessarily brief and perhaps somewhat generalizing outline of the two positions as they have taken shape in late twentieth century—predominantly Anglo-Saxon—Valerian scholarship. I should emphasize from the start that it is not my aim to challenge either of them, but rather to use them as complementary tools in my own analysis of this particular passage.[2]

The picture of Valerius as a confident poet, whose vision is firmly rooted in the grand structures of Latin epic, is most clearly articulated by Denis Feeney in the Valerian section of his *Gods in Epic*.[3] As a representative

Delphi for pointing out these parallels to me and/or discussing them with me. For more on funerals in Flavian epic, see the relevant chapters in the recent *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*.

[2] Unfortunately I have not been able to consult Traglia (1983) and Ferenczi (2007) on Valerius' literary self-positioning in relation to Virgil and Apollonius. In addition to the works cited in the following footnotes, see Zissos (2002); Río Torres-Murciano (2005).

[3] Feeney (1991) 313–337.

example of Valerius' poetic technique, Feeney discusses the two competing prophecies given by the Argonauts' seers Mopsus (1.205–226) and Idmon (1.227–239). Mopsus foresees terrible events along the way, Idmon success. Feeney argues that in this scene Valerius announces to his readers that his epic, like the *Aeneid*, will be open to both positive and negative interpretation, and that he is well aware of this from the very start of the poem.[4] The idea that Valerius schematically confronts Latin epic's positive and negative currents is further developed by Philip Hardie,[5] and Andrew Zissos makes use of this approach in his discussion of the transition between the fourth and the fifth book of Valerius' *Argonautica*, in which the "positive" half of the poem is closed off and the rather more troubling tragic half begins.[6]

At the end of his discussion of Valerius, Feeney mentions how the poet's treatment of the theme of boundary violation in relation to seafaring "tends powerfully towards the ameliorative"[7] and how this tendency is a characteristic of the Roman *Argonautica* as a whole.[8] The stress on Valerius' tendency towards the ameliorative is central to Debra Hershkowitz's monograph on the Roman *Argonautica*.[9] One of the central arguments of Hershkowitz's study is the claim that Valerius recuperates Apollonius' *Argonautica*, making it "Better, Stronger, Faster"—to quote part of the title of the book's third chapter. The *Aeneid* is often an important tool for Valerius in his recuperation of the Apollonian original. In the process, Valerius Romanizes the heroes and events of his Argonautic saga.[10] Hershkowitz argues that this recuperation takes place on the level of the plot as well: Valerius compresses or omits scenes present in Apollonius' epic (for example, the meeting with the sons of Phrixus at the Island of Ares is omitted by Valerius) or expands or adds scenes (e.g., the Colchian civil war, absent from Apollonius).[11] In this way Valerius creates a whole new epic poem, transforming Greek material to meet Roman needs and expectations. In a different way, Timothy Stover's recent monograph on the Roman *Argonautica* also stresses the confidently

---

4 Feeney (1991) 317.
5 Hardie (1993) 83–87.
6 Zissos (2004b).
7 Feeney (1991) 335.
8 Feeney (1991) 335–337.
9 Hershkowitz (1998).
10 See Hershkowitz (1998) 126–128 for a brief outline of her views on Valerius' technique of recuperation and Romanization.
11 See Seal's analysis in this volume, pp. 113–135.

recuperating side of the poem, arguing that Valerius' epic constitutes a return to heroic epic following Lucan's deconstructionist experiments.[12]

However, a different approach to Valerius' self-positioning in the poetic tradition is also possible. This approach treats Valerius' intertextual technique as enigmatic rather than straightforward. For example, Martha Malamud and Donald McGuire discuss Valerius' play with intertexts in the Hylas episode and argue that the various echoes and allusions in this tale create dissonances, and that it is virtually impossible to arrive at a final interpretation of the Hylas episode; we end up with an *Argonautica* that is "an endless voyage into the familiar made strange."[13] In one of his articles on Valerian intertextuality, Zissos emphasizes Valerius' tendency to alert the reader to narrative variants other than the ones that he has actually chosen in his epic. In doing so, Valerius continuously draws attention to the fictionality of his epic, and to his own position at the end of a vast poetic tradition that he is self-consciously manipulating.[14]

The first approach outlined above emphasizes Valerius' role as a Roman poet, who incorporates the Greek Argonautic saga into the grand themes and structures of heaven and hell, order and chaos, characteristic of Latin imperial epic from Virgil onwards.[15] The other approach focuses rather on an allusive technique of combinatorial imitation that features prominently in what we might call "Argonautic" epic, stretching from Apollonius to Valerius through Catullus 64 and Virgil. Apollonian scholarship has underscored the Hellenistic poet's endless complication of meaning through multi-layered allusions to Homer's *Odyssey*.[16] Catullus 64, with its Argonautic opening, is a veritable intertextual maze that resists final interpretation.[17] Finally, Damien Nelis has brought out the Apollonian side of Virgil's epic, showing how Virgil creates multi-layered allusions to both Homer's and Apollonius' epics to provide Aeneas' wanderings with a complex intertextual background.[18]

Obviously, this technique of combined or layered allusion is hardly characteristic of *nostos* epic exclusively—although one might say that it is a

---

12 Stover (2012). See Krasne in this volume for a response to Stover's approach, pp. 33–48. Cf. also Mitousi in this volume for an optimistic reading of Valerius' epic in relation to Flavian propaganda, pp. 153–168.

13 Malamud and McGuire (1993) 215.

14 Zissos (1999).

15 See Hardie (1993).

16 See Knight (1995) in particular on Apollonius' rewriting of Homer.

17 On the labyrinthine nature of Catullus' poem, see especially Gaisser (1995).

18 Nelis (2001).

branch of epic ideally suited to this technique, a branch in which similarities and differences between outward- and return journeys, stops along the way and final destinations can be mirrored, contrasted, and confused to no end. Generally speaking this allusive technique is employed by virtually all Hellenistic and Roman poets. In what may be called a foundational article in modern Flavian studies, Hardie has demonstrated more specifically how all three Flavian epicists used this technique of combinatorial imitation to comment on intriguing, enigmatic or problematic passages and intratextual parallels within the *Aeneid*.[19] Reading Valerius as a highly sophisticated interpreter of Virgil remains popular in Flavian scholarship, as is evidenced by such studies in Valerian intertextuality as those by Frank Schimann[20] and Matthew Leigh,[21] but also by Gauthier Liberman's general account of Valerius' relation to Virgil in the introduction to his text of and commentary on the Roman *Argonautica*.[22]

In what follows, I shall combine both of these two major approaches to Valerius in an analysis of a very specific passage of little more than sixty verses. I will begin by comparing Valerius' account of the deaths of Idmon and Tiphys with that of Apollonius: Valerius' version of these events can indeed be read as a confident restructuring of the Apollonian one, which Valerius compresses significantly. Subsequently, we shall consider the passage at hand as an intertextual reflection on Virgil's treatment of two major motifs from the tradition of *nostos* epic: that of one or more deaths along the shore on the one hand, and that of the sacrifice of one for the survival of many on the other. Both of these motifs figure prominently in the *Aeneid*, as the Trojans lose both Palinurus and Misenus before Aeneas can enter the Underworld. Valerius' epic offers a highly intelligent interpretation and reworking of the problems inherent in Virgil's treatment of these motifs. In turn, Valerius' reception of Virgil's narrative can offer us important insights into the dynamics and anxieties of his self-positioning within the epic tradition.

19 Hardie (1989).
20 Schimann (1998).
21 Leigh (2010).
22 Liberman (1997) xxxii–xlvi.

2. *Restructuring Apollonius*

The first part of the fifth book of Valerius' *Argonautica* tells of the Argonauts' journey along the Black Sea coast, followed by their arrival in Colchis. Valerius' description of this journey along the coast (V. Fl. 5.1–216) is a highly compressed version of Apollonius' account of the same journey (A. R. 2.815–1285).[23] Structurally, however, the position of this travelogue at the beginning of the fifth book instead of the end of the fourth book is indebted to Virgil rather than Apollonius. Like the second half of Valerius' *Argonautica*, the second half of the *Aeneid* opens with a coastal journey (Virg. *Aen.* 7.1–36). Both travelogues are followed by a delayed invocation that introduces the main subjects and themes of the second half of the poem (V. Fl. 5.217–224; *Aen.* 7.37–45).[24] It is important to observe that, even though Valerius' travelogue may be much shorter than its Apollonian counterpart, it is still significantly longer than the Virgilian one. The Argonautic narrative may have been moved to the second half of the epic rather than the first to conform to Virgilian practice, but even in compressed form it is still long enough to delay the invocation even further than it had been in the *Aeneid*. Even as the Apollonian material is transformed in Virgilian fashion, it exerts its own transformational force on Virgilian structures. We will see that something similar occurs in Valerius' reworking of the deaths of Idmon and Tiphys: Valerius uses the *Aeneid* to refashion his Argonautic material, but the Virgilian passages used to that effect do not escape unharmed either.

My discussion of the passage at hand begins with some statistics. Apollonius devotes twenty lines to his description of Idmon's death (A. R. 2.815–834), little over seven lines to the funeral (2.835–842) and concludes with an aetiological misunderstanding connected to the seer's burial mound (2.842–

---

[23] On Valerius' technique of compressing Apollonius' narrative, see Hershkowitz (1998) 207–218.

[24] See Schetter (1959), further developing ideas present in Mehmel (1934) 56, on *Aeneid* 7 as a structural model for *Argonautica* 5. See Hershkowitz (1998) 1–34, with 7–8 focusing on the beginning of the fifth book, for a comprehensive discussion of the possible length and conclusion of Valerius' epic in relation to its literary models. In this article, I assume that the fifth book introduces the second half of the poem as Valerius had envisioned it. In addition to the explicit proem in the middle starting at line 217, Krasne (2011) 136–137 argues that Jason's desperate words following the deaths of Idmon and Tiphys (V. Fl. 5.37–54) can be read as a proem in disguise, beginning at the same line number as Virgil's proem in the middle of the *Aeneid*. I would like to thank Darcy Krasne for sharing with me the relevant section of her dissertation.

850). The description of the death of Tiphys and its consequences are introduced with the question τίς γὰρ δὴ θάνεν ἄλλος; ("Who else then died?" 2.851). Tiphys' actual death is described very briefly (2.851–857), after which Apollonius directs our attention to the grief that seizes the Argonauts and their despair over their homecoming now that they have buried their helmsman (2.858–863).

In Valerius' version, the death of Idmon is reduced to twelve lines (V. Fl. 5.1–12). While the Argonauts are mourning him (5.13–14), Tiphys falls ill (5.15). Despite the Argonauts' prayers, he dies (5.15–31). As they light his pyre, it seems as if the Argo herself is burning (5.32–34).[25] As the flames roar, Jason laments the loss of his comrades (5.35–55). He orders that they be buried in the same mound (5.56–62). Apollonius follows the funerals with a description of the election of a new helmsman (A. R. 2.864–898). In Valerius' considerably briefer version, the Argo herself appoints Tiphys' successor (V. Fl. 5.63–72).[26]

Whereas Apollonius devotes a lot of attention to the details of the actual death in the case of Idmon and to the helmsman-crisis in the case of Tiphys, Valerius focuses on the grief and despair, stressed by Jason's speech and a simile (5.22–24); he also devotes far more attention to Tiphys than to Idmon. The compression of Valerius' account, in which both deaths are closely connected, has been variously interpreted.[27] I limit myself to an intertextual approach in this article, showing in the present section how Valerius tries his best to turn the two funerals into one, exploiting the possibilities inherent in Apollonius' text.

---

25 On this and other instances of the destruction of the Argo in Valerius' epic, see Krasne's analysis in this volume, pp. 33–48.

26 Although closely connected to the preceding deaths, for reasons of focus the election of the Argo's new helmsman falls outside the scope of this article.

27 On Valerius' compression in comparison with Apollonius in this passage, see also Mehmel (1934) 22; Adamietz (1976) 63–64; and Finkmann's discussion in this volume, pp. 87–89 in particular. Spaltenstein (2004) 389 considers the funerals of Idmon and Tiphys part of Valerius' more general strategy of compression in this part of his epic. For Zissos (2004b) 328–331 and Krasne (2011) 136–139 the joined deaths and funerals at the beginning of the fifth book of the epic are part of important structural and thematic patterns. Zissos emphasizes Valerius' radical termination of the more optimistically epic teleology of the first half of the epic, symbolized by the seer Idmon and the helmsman Tiphys, which is about to give way to the tragic second half of the poem. Krasne interprets the confusion of both men's ashes at the end of this scene, to which I return below, as part of a more general pattern of category confusion running through the *Argonautica*. Although this article focuses on intertextual matters, both Zissos' and Krasne's readings of this passage should be central to an interpretation of its role in the larger structures of Valerius' epic.

Henri Wijsman suggests that the joint tomb in the Roman *Argonautica* is Valerius' interpretation of Apollonius' δὴ γὰρ ἐπεὶ καὶ τόνδε παρασχεδὸν ἐκτερέιξαν ("for as soon as they had buried him too," A. R. 2.859).[28] In his reading of this line, Valerius opts for a spatial rather than a temporal meaning of παρασχεδόν, in agreement with at least one scholiast on Apollonius.[29] Liberman and Spaltenstein provide sensible counterarguments to Wijsman's suggestion,[30] but we should note that Apollonius' account of Tiphys' death does at the very least invite the reader to consider the possibility that the deaths of both men are so similar to each other that they are almost the same.[31] It is instructive to examine this passage in more detail:

τίς γὰρ δὴ θάνεν ἄλλος; ἐπεὶ καὶ ἔτ' αὖτις ἔχευαν
ἥρωες τότε τύμβον ἀποφθιμένου ἑτάροιο·
δοιὰ γὰρ οὖν κείνων ἔτι σήματα φαίνεται ἀνδρῶν.
Ἁγνιάδην Τῖφυν θανέειν φάτις· οὐδέ οἱ ἦεν
μοῖρ' ἔτι ναυτίλλεσθαι ἑκαστέρω· ἀλλά νυ καὶ τὸν
αὖθι μινυνθαδίη πάτρης ἑκὰς εὔνασε νοῦσος,
εἰσότ' Ἀβαντιάδαο νέκυν κτερέιξεν ὅμιλος. (A. R. 2.851–857)

Who else then died? For the heroes heaped up yet another burial mound at that time for a departed comrade, since two grave-markers of those men can still be seen. It is reported that Hagnias' son Tiphys died; nor was it his fate to sail any further. Rather, a brief illness laid him as well to rest there, far from his homeland, just after the crew had buried the corpse of Abas' son.

In these seven lines, the words ἄλλος (2.851), καὶ ἔτ' αὖτις (2.851), δοιά (2.853), and καὶ (2.855) stress the idea of duplication. In addition, both Apollonius' descriptions of the raising of the funeral mounds as well as the phrases introducing the respective deaths are very similar. The lines ἐπεὶ καὶ ἔτ' αὖτις ἔχευαν / ἥρωες τότε τύμβον ἀποφθιμένου ἑταιροιο (2.851–852) recall καὶ δή τοι κέχυται τοῦδ' ἀνέρος ἐν χθονὶ κείνῃ / τύμβος ("and so this man's burial mound was raised in that land," 2.841–842). Ἁγνιάδην Τῖφυν θανέειν φάτις (2.854) and μοῖρ' (2.855) recall ἔνθα δ' Ἀβαντιάδην πεπρωμένη ἤλασε μοῖρα / Ἴδμονα ("and there his fated destiny struck Abas' son Idmon," 2.815–816). Finally, Tiphys is described as dying as soon as Idmon has been buried (2.855–857).[32] Idmon's

28 Wijsman (1996) 43. For a recent short overview of the scholarly debate on Valerius and the Scholia on Apollonius, see Galli (2007b).

29 See Fränkel (1968) 238, to whom Wijsman refers.

30 Liberman (2002) 161 and Spaltenstein (2004) 402. See also Vian (1974) 279.

31 See also Krevans (2000) 81, who calls Tiphys "Idmon's nautical double."

32 Durbec (2008) 66–67 also observes Apollonius' stress on the simultaneity of both men's deaths in these lines, and in addition points to A. R. 1.105–108 and 144–145, in which respec-

patronymic, with which Apollonius had introduced his account of the seer's death (2.815), is repeated.

Valerius follows Apollonius in presenting the deaths of Idmon and Tiphys as each other's doubles. The crewmen are burnt *geminis … / … rogis* ("on twin pyres," V. Fl. 5.35–36), and Jason sees *bina … funera* ("two funeral pyres," V. Fl. 5.39) rising on the shore.[33] Both phrases call to mind Apollonius' δοιὰ γὰρ οὖν κείνων ἔτι σήματα φαίνεται ἀνδρῶν (A. R. 2.853). But picking up on the Apollonian hints outlined in the preceding paragraph, Valerius goes beyond them to link both deaths in other ways as well. In the Greek *Argonautica*, the ways in which both Argonauts died differ significantly. Apollonius' Idmon dies after an attack by a κάπριος ἀγριόδων ("a white-tusked boar," 2.820); Tiphys is killed by a μινυνθαδίῃ … νοῦσος (2.856). But in Valerius' text, both deaths are similar: Idmon is killed *morbis fatisque rapacibus* (by a "disease and ravaging fate," V. Fl. 5.2);[34] as Idmon's pyre is being erected, Tiphys is seized by a *uiolenta lues* ("violent disease," 5.15). The Argonauts themselves link both deaths as well. As Tiphys is dying, the crewmembers are reminded of the dying Idmon: *ille recens oculis interuolat Idmon* ("Idmon's late doom hovers before their eyes," 5.27). In addition, Valerius describes the mourning for both men in similar terms, repeating *lacrimas* and *munera*. Tiphys is seized by illness *inter lacrimas interque extrema uirorum / munera* ("amidst their tears and their last offerings," 5.13–14) for the dead Idmon; after Tiphys' death the Argonauts *uix membra rigentia tandem / imposuere rogo lacrimasque et munera flammis / uana ferunt* ("hardly at length they set on the pyre the rigid limbs, and bring tears and vain offerings to the flames," 5.29–31).

But Valerius' rewriting is most extreme when he makes Jason give the order to bury Idmon and Tiphys together. There is only one σῆμα in Valerius' text, for Jason orders both men to be buried in the same mound:

> 'quod tamen externis unum solamen in oris
> restat,' ait, 'caras humus haec non diuidat umbras
> ossaque nec tumulo nec separe contegat urna,
> sed simul, ut iunctis uenistis in aequora fatis.' (V. Fl. 5.56–59)

---

tively Tiphys' and Idmon's skills in observation are mentioned by Apollonius—another way in which the poet establishes a connection between both men.

33 The pairing of Idmon and Tiphys here is also discussed by Krasne (2011) 138–139, who observes that Jason's (con)fusion of both Argonauts in fact undoes pairs established by Valerius earlier in his epic (Tiphys and Argus; Idmon and Mopsus).

34 The similarity between the two deaths—a marked difference between Apollonius and Valerius—has been frequently noted. See e.g., Wijsman (1996) 15 and Spaltenstein (2004) 389 for overviews of ancient *testimonia* concerning Idmon's death. Cf. also n. 27 above.

> "One solace yet remains," he cried, "on distant shores though we be; let not this earth sunder these loving shades, nor hold their bones in separate tomb or urn, but joined together, as with joint destiny you went to sea."

The words *non diuidat* (57), *nec separe* (58), *simul* (59), and *iunctis* (59) stress the symbolic erasure of the difference between the deaths of Idmon and Tiphys through their shared fate and tomb. And finally, the two men truly become indistinguishable, as *reliquias socii defletaque miscent / nomina* ("their comrades unite their relics and the names they mourned," 5.60–61).[35]

3. *Deaths along the Shore*

Why does Valerius choose to keep the two deaths separate from each other on the one hand—sidelining Idmon somewhat, and devoting full attention to Tiphys—but to conflate the two funerals on the other? To understand fully the tension between these two pulls, the one tending towards splitting up, the other towards conflation, we have to take Virgil's and Apollonius' own rewriting of the Greek epic tradition into account. In this section I will therefore briefly consider the epic motifs of "one or more deaths accompanying a *katabasis*" and "one or more deaths guaranteeing safe passage."[36]

The first and most famous death accompanying a *katabasis* in ancient epic is that of Odysseus' companion, Elpenor. Moving on to Homer's Greek epic successor, several scholars have pointed out that Apollonius casts the Argonauts' travel along the Black Sea coast as a *katabasis* in disguise.[37] In

[35] On the confusion between Idmon and Tiphys in this passage, see also Krasne (2011) 138–139. On the precise interpretation of the phrase *miscent / nomina*, see Wijsman (1996) 44 and Spaltenstein (2004) 402, in response to earlier scholarship. I take it here to refer to the men Idmon and Tiphys themselves. But the phrase may also be read as a metapoetic comment on Valerius' intertextual conflation and confusion of victims along the shore—both Apollonian and Virgilian—in this part of his epic. This will be discussed in greater detail below.

[36] For reasons of space, discussion of, and reference to, the vast secondary literature on this topic have been kept to a minimum. The focus of the second half of this article is Valerius' response to Virgil's particular kind of engagement with this tradition rather than a comprehensive overview of this tradition itself. In addition to the secondary literature cited, see Segal (1965) on the significance of the figure of Misenus and his relation to Palinurus; Lossau (1980) and Setaioli (1997) on problems surrounding the figure of Palinurus (who becomes complicit in the confusion surrounding his demise when he tells Aeneas a version of his death which is notoriously different from *Aen.* 5 [*Aen.* 6.347–371]) and on his relation to Elpenor and other sources in particular; Bandera (1981) and Hardie (1993) 19–56 on sacrifice in the *Aeneid*.

[37] Other parts of Apollonius' epic, such as the journey through Libya, have been inter-

keeping with this, Apollonius alludes to the fate of Elpenor in his description of Idmon's death and funeral.[38] Virgil's Latin epic also contains the motif of "deaths accompanying a *katabasis*," and the poet goes beyond Apollonius by including no less than three of them: of Palinurus shortly before Aeneas' arrival in Italy; of Misenus directly preceding Aeneas' descent into the Underworld; and of Caieta directly following it. G.N. Knauer has demonstrated that Virgil has divided Elpenor's fate over his three victims: Aeneas encounters Palinurus in the Underworld, requesting burial, just as Odysseus had encountered the shade of Elpenor requesting burial; Misenus' burial is directly inspired by that of Elpenor; Caieta is buried after Aeneas' return from the Underworld, just as Elpenor is buried by Odysseus after *his* return from the Underworld.[39] In addition to this, Nelis has shown in great detail that the figure of Palinurus throughout the *Aeneid* is indebted to Apollonius' Tiphys, but composed from many other models as well, and that Misenus' death and funeral are based on that of Idmon.[40] In what follows, I will focus on Valerius' reception of the figures of Palinurus and Misenus, in a part of his epic that has been read as another *katabasis* in disguise.[41]

In addition to this general picture, I would like to draw attention to the passage shortly preceding Palinurus' death, in which Neptune guarantees Venus that the Trojans will only have to give up one life to ensure the safety of all: *unus erit tantum amissum quem gurgite quaeres; / unum pro multis dabitur caput* ("one only shall there be whom, lost in the flood, you will seek in vain; one life shall be given for many," Virg. *Aen.* 5.814–815). In this passage, Neptune emphasizes that the sacrifice of only one life will be needed to guarantee safe passage to reach the Underworld (note the prominent anaphora of *unus* and *unum* at the beginning of each line). Strictly speaking, Palinurus is indeed the only one to die before the Trojans reach the coast of Italy. But Misenus will also die before Aeneas enters the Underworld: his burial is the last event before Aeneas' actual descent. Neptune is true to his word then, but this passage also plays with the fact that the *Aeneid* features two Elpenors instead of one. When a reader returns

preted as disguised *katabaseis* as well. See Kyriakou (1995) 256 n. 4 for a comprehensive overview of the debate on this topic.

38 Discussed by Hunter (1993) 44.

39 Knauer (1964) 135–139.

40 Nelis (2001) 221–223 and 242–244 respectively, with reference to earlier scholarship.

41 On elements of *katabasis* in the middle of the Roman *Argonautica*, see e.g., Wijsman (1996) 4 and 50 and Groß (2003) 89 n. 295, 104 n. 327, 106–108, both with reference to earlier scholarship.

to this passage from the fifth book of the *Aeneid* having read the sixth book, Neptune's linking of the death of a companion to reaching or passing Avernus may bring to mind Misenus rather than Palinurus.

Neptune's message has been questioned by readers at least as early as Servius, who states (ad *Aen.* 5.814) that this line refers to Misenus and adduces the following parallel: *inter saxa uirum spumosa immerserat unda* ("[Triton] plunged him in the foaming waves amid the rocks," Virg. *Aen.* 6.174). Servius' parallel brings out clearly that both men fall victim to "death by water" in Virgil's cryptic descriptions of their respective fates: compare—as Servius had—*in gurgite* (5.814) with *unda* (6.174). But Servius also states (ad *Aen.* 5.815) that the *following* line refers to Palinurus, and DServius argues that we should properly interpret Neptune's prophecy as being about two victims rather than one, because both men die before Aeneas enters the Underworld. Servius' comments may go back to confusion about the precise meaning of Neptune's words among Virgil's earliest readers and commentators. In the following section, I shall discuss how Valerius, one of Virgil's most perceptive readers, responds to such interpretative problems.[42]

4. *Correcting Virgil*

As emerges from the preceding overview, Valerius' simultaneous separation and confusion of Idmon and Tiphys forms part of a long tradition in Greek and Roman *nostos* epic of splitting up and merging crewmembers lost along the way. More specifically, Valerius' rewriting of the deaths and funerals of Idmon and Tiphys as described in Apollonius' epic is part of his re-interpretation of the three Virgilian deaths along the shore: Palinurus, Misenus, and Caieta. Structurally speaking, Valerius' deaths at the beginning of the fifth book match the death of Caieta at the beginning of Virgil's seventh book (Virg. *Aen.* 7.1–7).[43] Thematically speaking, the loss of the helmsman Tiphys is closely connected to the loss of Aeneas' helmsman Palinurus. But intertextually speaking, most of the allusions to the *Aeneid* that com-

42 Servius' confusing interpretation has had a long afterlife, and many scholars have felt the need to combat it. See e.g., Heinze (1915^3) 452 n. 1 and Williams (1960) xxvii. On the supposed inconsistency of epic poets (including Virgil in his treatment of Palinurus), see O'Hara (2007). See Schimann (1998) 126–127 on Valerius as a precursor to Servius in his role of interpreter of the *Aeneid*. I would like to thank Ruurd Nauta for suggesting to me that Valerius' allusions to this Virgilian passage can be viewed as taking part in an interpretative debate anticipating the tradition of commentators on the *Aeneid*.

43 See n. 24 above and Wijsman (1996) 17–18.

mentators have identified link the Idmon and Tiphys passage to Misenus. In this final section, I discuss Valerius' intertextual response to the presence of both Palinurus and Misenus in Virgil's epic. On the one hand, Valerius assumes a position of superior hindsight in his role of commentator on Virgil. On the other hand the very problems within the *Aeneid* that Valerius tries to solve reappear in his *Argonautica*, albeit in curiously altered form. In addition, in this passage Valerius applies to Virgil's text the very same allusive technique of compression that he applies to Apollonius' text.

A few hundred lines before the actual description of the deaths of Idmon and Tiphys, Valerius had announced his upcoming engagement with Virgil's deaths along the shore in the fourth book of his *Argonautica*. In the fourth book, the seer Phineus predicts the deaths of Idmon and Tiphys, although not mentioning the seer and the helmsman by name:[44]

> hic lecto comitum de robore siquem
> perculerit uicina lues, ne defice casus
> praedicti memor atque animos accinge futuris.
> illic pestiferas subter iuga concaua torquet
> alter aquas Acheron uastoque exundat hiatu
> fumeus et saeua sequitur caligine campos.
> linque grauem fluuium et miseris sua fata colonis:
> sic quoque non uno dabitur transcurrere luctu. (V. Fl. 4.591–598)

> If here [in the kingdom of Lycus] the pestilence of the place strike any of your chosen heroes, do not lose heart, remembering the foretelling of the mischance, and gird up your spirit for the future. There beneath mountain caves another Acheron whirls plague-bringing waters, and through a vast chasm boils up in steam, and with its dire mist infests the fields; leave behind you the dangerous river, and the wretched folk to bear their doom; even so not one sorrow only will your passing cost you.

Paul Murgatroyd rightly remarks that Phineus conceals the exact number of deaths from the Argonauts, in order not to frighten them too much. This is in keeping with Idmon's hiding of his own death at the beginning of the epic.[45] But I would also like to read this passage as an anticipation of the funereal conflation and confusion ahead in the fifth book. In the last line quoted here, *non uno dabitur* cleverly puns on *unum … dabitur caput* (Virg. *Aen.* 5.815). Valerius' Phineus corrects Virgil's Neptune: more than one man will die in both the *Aeneid* and this *Argonautica* to guarantee safe passage to

44 On Jason's meeting with Phineus in Valerius' *Argonautica*, see especially Lesueur (1978); Groß (2003) 64–108; and Manuwald (2009) with references.

45 Murgatroyd (2009) 282–283.

Avernus or past Acheron, not just one. The allusion to the Virgilian passage is further strengthened through *Acheron* in V. Fl. 4.595, which echoes *Auerni* (*Aen.* 5.813).[46] In addition, the Argonauts' cry to Apollo (V. Fl. 5.18) to save at least *hoc caput* may be a sly allusion to Virgil's Neptune passage.

Clever and pedantic though Valerius' correction may be, one could say that his *Argonautica* still makes good on Neptune's promise in a different sense, albeit in a roundabout way. To set things straight, Valerius' poem will contain the Virgilian paradox in reverse: his epic does contain two deaths along the shore, but there is only one funeral mound raised when we reach the end of the episode. In the *Aeneid*, both Misenus and Palinurus receive a burial mound that will guarantee them an *aeternum* … *nomen* (Virg. *Aen.* 6.235 and 381 respectively).[47] But in Valerius' epic, we witness a return to Apollonius' aetiological mix-up concerning the grave of Idmon (A. R. 2.844–850), as the Argonauts *miscent / nomina* (V. Fl. 5.60–61).[48]

This allusive commentary is not the only way in which Valerius responds to the tension present within the *Aeneid* between Palinurus as the *unum* … *caput* on the one hand and the victimhood he shares with his double Misenus on the other. Valerius' Tiphys is modeled not only on Apollonius' Tiphys but also on Virgil's Palinurus. For example, Valerius bases his Tiphys' dozing off and thereby steering the Argonauts back to Cyzicus on Virgil's description of Palinurus falling asleep shortly before his death.[49] We have to wait, however, two more books for Tiphys' death and burial together with that of Idmon. But in describing this funeral, Valerius makes use of the funeral of Palinurus' double, Misenus.

As we shall see, the fact that Valerius uses the Misenus passage to conflate his two funerals, having first described his Tiphys' dozing-off in terms reminiscent of Palinurus' death, again emphasizes the paradoxical nature of his response to Virgil. In the funeral scene the differences between Apollo-

---

46 Murgatroyd (2009) 284–285 points out allusions to descriptions of Acheron in the second book of Apollonius' *Argonautica* and the seventh book of the *Aeneid* in V. Fl. 4.594–596 (Virg. *Aen.* 7.566–570 in particular). Spaltenstein (2004) 347–348 also identifies some of the Apollonian material and suggests Virg. *Aen.* 6.296 (*uasta* … *uoragine*) as a possible precursor for Valerius' *uasto* … *hiatu* (V. Fl. 4.595).

47 Norden (1926^3) 197–198; Austin (1977) 107–108.

48 I would like to thank Ruurd Nauta for pointing out to me this play on Virgilian *nomina* and Apollonian aetiology.

49 Observed by Lüthje (1971) 95; Adamietz (1976) 43 n. 26. For more details, see e.g., Manuwald (1999) 47; Spaltenstein (2004) 14 and 17; Ciccarelli (2005) 492–493. Adamietz (1976) 42–43 and 118 notes structural parallels between the Cyzicus episode and the beginning of the fifth book of Valerius' epic.

nius' and Valerius' Idmon and Tiphys and Virgil's Palinurus and Misenus are erased; even the boundaries between separate textual elements *within* Virgil's description of Misenus' funeral are erased by Valerius. But within the very *structure* of Valerius' epic the scenes that defined Palinurus and Misenus respectively (helmsman dozing off ~ funeral on the shore) are indelibly there.

By way of conclusion, I shall consider in what way exactly Valerius uses the funeral of Misenus in his rewriting of the deaths and funerals of Idmon and Tiphys. He starts off innocently enough, by basing his description of the cremation of Idmon on that of Misenus (Virg. *Aen.* 6.176–182 and 212–235), just as Virgil had based that of Misenus on Apollonius' Idmon. The allusions to Misenus' funeral are somewhat scattered and may therefore seem rather insignificant at first sight, but upon closer inspection Misenus is present in virtually every line:

> tum comiti pia iusta tulit caelataque multa
> arte Dolionii donat uelamina regis,
> hospes humum sedemque Lycus. flens arma reuellit
> Idmonis e celsa Mopsus rate. robora caedunt
> pars siluis portantque arae, pars auguris alba
> fronde ⟨caput⟩ uittisque ligant positumque feretro
> congemuere; dies simul et suus admonet omnes. (V. Fl. 5.6–12)

> Then he [Jason] pays to his comrade the dues of friendship, and brings as a tribute the skillfully embroidered raiment of the Dolionian prince, while Lycus their host offers ground for his last resting-place. Mopsus in tears takes Idmon's equipment[50] from the lofty vessel; some cut down timber from the woods and bring it to the pyre; others bind fillets and white foliage about the augur's head, and setting him on the bier unite in lamentation; all alike bethink them of their own appointed day.

In the *Aeneid*, Misenus is covered in *purpureas ... uestis, uelamina nota* ("purple robes, the familiar dress," *Aen.* 6.221); Jason gives Idmon *caelata ... multa / arte ... uelamina* (5.6–7).[51] In both funeral descriptions the dead man's *arma* are mentioned (V. Fl. 5.8 ~ *Aen.* 6.233).[52] In both cases an *ara* is raised (V. Fl.

[50] The translation of *arma* has been altered; see n. 52 below.

[51] Wijsman (1996) 21 collects this and many other significant parallels between the funeral of Idmon and that of Misenus.

[52] See Austin (1977) 107 on the precise meaning of this word in this context: "outfit," "equipment," or rather "arms." Austin opts for the former, contrasting it with *fulgentibus armis* (*Aen.* 6.217). See also Norden (1926³) 197, who has shifted his position from the latter to the former meaning over the course of the years. On the meaning of this word in Valerius, see Wijsman (1996) 18 and Spaltenstein (2004) 391–393: Wijsman is open to both possibilities,

5.10 ~ *Aen.* 6.177),[53] and both Idmon and Misenus are laid on a *feretrum* (V. Fl. 5.11 ~ *Aen.* 6.222).[54] In both cases a forest is plundered to erect the pyre. Valerius describes this in terms quite similar to Virgil's. Compare his *robora caedunt / pars siluis portantque arae* (V. Fl. 5.9–10) with *itur in antiquam siluam* ("they pass into the forest primeval," *Aen.* 6.179) and *fraxineaeque trabes cuneis et fissile robur / scinditur* ("ashen logs and splintering oak are cleft with wedges," *Aen.* 6.181–182).[55] Note Valerius' repetition of Virgil's *silua* and *robur* in plural forms. Finally, in both descriptions the separation of Idmon's and Misenus' companions into two different groups, fulfilling specific tasks, is expressed through a *pars … pars …* construction (V. Fl. 5.9–12 ~ *Aen.* 6.218–224).[56]

I have already shown in my discussion of the Apollonian intertexts that the death of Tiphys becomes more similar to that of Idmon as we approach the end of the passage. We should note in addition that it is also at the end of the passage that the allusions to Misenus' funeral reappear, but now encompass the funeral of both Idmon and Tiphys. In the *Aeneid*, the death of Misenus was a double of Palinurus' death. Reversing the process, Valerius now uses Misenus' funeral to erase the difference between the two Apollonian deaths on the shore.

Interestingly, Valerius seems to apply this technique of conflation not only to the Argonautic funerals, but also to the Virgilian passage that he is using to achieve this conflation, as he compresses that which is separate in Virgil. In fact, we have already seen Valerius applying this technique of combinatorial compression in the few lines discussed above. In Virgil's epic, Misenus funeral is split in two (*Aen.* 6.176–182 and 212–235), interrupted as it is by Aeneas' quest for the Golden Bough (*Aen.* 6.183–211). By alluding to lines from both the first and the second Misenus scene within a single, very short passage, Valerius has brought together what is separate in Virgil. But as it turns out, Idmon's funeral is not over yet, and Valerius will continue his allusive compression of the Virgilian intertext about forty verses later.

Spaltenstein chooses the latter in both Virgil and Valerius. I choose the former interpretation here in light of Elpenor's "original" Homeric oar in Hom. *Od.* 12.15 (adduced by Wijsman [1996] 18 as a possible source of inspiration for Valerius).

53 On the use of *ara* for *rogus*, see Wijsman (1996) 20; Liberman (2002) 160; Dräger (2003) 449; and Spaltenstein (2004) 392–393.

54 Wijsman (1996) 21.

55 See Wijsman (1996) 19 for an overview of possible sources Valerius might have used here, including Virgil's scene of deforestation. See also Spaltenstein (2004) 99 and 392.

56 Wijsman (1996) 20.

Paradoxically, Valerius' insertion of a small gap between these two instances of his reworking of Misenus' funeral proves that he is just as good at splitting up funerals as he is at conflating them.

In the final lines of the Idmon and Tiphys passage, in the actual mingling of the ashes, Valerius' allusive technique is operating almost at the microscopic level. It is here that combinatorial compression takes place both at the level of the individual sentence as well as at the level of the entire Misenus passage. To begin with the sentence level: Wijsman calls *flammis … labentibus* in Valerius (*sola uirum flammis uidit labentibus ossa*, "and as the flames sank down [Jason] only saw their bones remaining," V. Fl. 5.55) "a case of internal conflation of *Aen.* 6.226" (*conlapsi cineres et flamma quieuit*, "the ashes fell in and the flame died away").[57] The beginning and end of the Misenus story are conflated in V. Fl. 5.60–61: *haud mora, reliquias socii defletaque miscent / nomina* ("without delay their comrades unite their relics and the names they mourned"). Wijsman refers to Virg. *Aen.* 6.220, from the second part of Virgil's description, where Misenus' remains are called *membra … defleta*;[58] and although *haud mora* is not an unusual phrase in the *Aeneid*, Valerius may be alluding to a very specific instance here, the introduction to the funeral of Misenus: *tum iussa Sibyllae, / haud mora, festinant aramque sepulcri / congerere arboribus caeloque educere certant* ("then, weeping, they quickly carry out the Sibyl's commands and toil to pile up trees for the altar of his tomb and rear it to the sky," *Aen.* 6.176–178). And so Valerius' funereal paralleling and mirroring, conflation and confusion are concluded. All distinctions are eventually erased—not only the distinctions between individuals, but even the distinctions between the words and sentences that constituted the text of the *Aeneid*.

5. *Conclusion*

What do the deaths and funerals of Idmon and Tiphys at the beginning of the fifth book of Valerius' *Argonautica* tell us about Valerius' self-positioning in the literary tradition, and between his major Greek and his major Latin predecessor in particular? Of course, in a sense this article has only skimmed the surface, leaving many possible intertexts out and focusing on a small selection of passages isolated from broader thematic concerns.

57 Wijsman (1996) 42.
58 Wijsman (1996) 43.

Nevertheless, various aspects of Valerius' intertextual technique have clearly emerged. Moreover, these aspects operate not in a contradictory but rather in a complementary fashion.

On the one hand, Valerius' version of the epic "deaths on the coast"-motif confidently rewrites the Apollonian intertext, exploiting elements already present in the Hellenistic poet that suggest that the figures of Idmon and Tiphys can be merged. But even in this rewriting a tension can be discerned between a wish to distinguish between Idmon and Tiphys on the one hand and a desire to conflate them on the other. This tension derives from two elements of the epic tradition that Valerius inherits: that of a death preceding a *katabasis* on the one hand, and that of the sacrifice of one for many on the other. Both motifs receive complex treatment in the *Aeneid*, in which the death of the helmsman Palinurus is doubled by that of Misenus before Aeneas enters the Underworld.

Valerius responds to Virgil's use of these motifs with a complexity worthy of his Roman predecessor. On the one hand, Valerius plays the role of the clever commentator, responding to paradoxes and problems within Virgil's text. In his engagement with Virgil, Valerius tries to reorganize the Augustan epic to meet his own needs, and he distances himself from his Roman predecessor through allusive criticism and confusion of problematic passages. On the other hand, the Virgilian problems and paradoxes re-emerge from the process of Argonautic rewriting—often ingeniously altered, but nevertheless undeniably present.

Part of Valerius' rewriting of Virgil's epic is the Flavian poet's exploitation of possibilities for literary restructuring and compression presented by the *Aeneid* in a way comparable to his restructuring and compression of Apollonius' *Argonautica*. Vice versa, Valerius' rewriting of the Greek *Argonautica* can also be interpreted as a commentator's response to parallels and interpretative problems in Apollonius' epic.[59] In fact, Valerius often combines the techniques of compression and combinatorial allusion in his treatment of the deaths of Idmon and Tiphys. At the beginning of the fifth book of Valerius' *Argonautica*, restructuring Apollonius and deconstructing Virgil turn out to be two sides of the same coin.

---

59 See p. 102 above.

CIVIL WAR AND THE APOLLONIAN MODEL IN VALERIUS' *ARGONAUTICA*[*]

Carey Seal

In the fifth and sixth books of his *Argonautica*, Valerius Flaccus describes a civil war in Colchis between the Colchian king Aeetes and his brother Perses. Aeetes is warned by the shade of Phrixus that his supremacy in Colchis will end when the Golden Fleece is removed from the land (5.236–237). Colchis is beset by terrifying portents and a priest urges the return of the Fleece (5.259–262). It is at this point that civil war breaks out, and soon after its eruption Jason arrives:

> contra Sole satus Phrixi praecepta uolutans
> aegro corde negat nec uulgi cura tyranno
> dum sua sit modo tuta salus. tunc ordine regi
> proximus et frater materno sanguine Perses
> increpitare uirum, sequitur duce turba reperto.
> ille furens ira solio se proripit alto
> praecipitatque patres ipsumque ut talibus ausis
> spem sibi iam rerum uulgi leuitate serentem
> ense petit. rapit inde fugam crudelia Perses
> signa gerens omnemque quatit rumoribus Arcton.
> iamque aderat magnis regum cum milibus urbi
> primaque in aduersos frustratus proelia muros
> constiterat. (V. Fl. 5.263–275)

> But the Sun's offspring ponders with faint heart the warnings of Phrixus and says no; the tyrant does not care about his folk, so long as his own safety is assured. Then Perses, next in rank to the king and blood-brother on his mother's side, assails him with reproach: the crowd, finding a leader, lend support. But he in furious rage starts from his lofty seat and sends the fathers flying headlong; rather against Perses himself he rushes with the sword, as by such ventures he boldly sows for himself hopes of power, thanks to the mob's favor. Perses flees from the place, with marks of cruelty upon him and with rumors stirs up all the North. And now he was present before the city with princes in their mighty thousands, and had halted, baffled in his first assault upon the walls.

[*] I am grateful to Antony Augoustakis, Marden Nichols, and the participants in the Flavian conference at Delphi for their comments.

Aeetes induces the Argonauts to join the war on his side (5.534–546), and with their help Perses and his allies are routed (6.723–751).

This civil war narrative is Valerius' most extended deviation from his poem's key model, the *Argonautica* of Apollonius, and as far as can be determined it is his own invention.[1] Plausible explanations have been proposed: the "theme of civil war between brothers" is "characteristic of Flavian imagination and culture"; the battle scenes "create a more exact correspondence to the two-part structure (voyage and war) of Virgil's epic"; the episode's *teichoscopia* allows for the fuller and subtler delineation of Jason and Medea as characters.[2] This paper supplements these accounts by arguing that Valerius uses the civil war, and in particular description of its causes, to bring about a reconciliation of the Roman tradition that the Argo is the first ship with the Apollonian version of the story, in which the Argo's place in history is figured quite differently. The civil war narrative thus marks the heightening and refinement, rather than the abatement or suspension, of Valerius' engagement with his Hellenistic predecessor.

---

[1] A possible Apollonian point of departure for the story is A. R. 3.351–353, in which Aeetes' grandson Argus tells the Colchian king that Jason is willing to fight the Sauromatae on the former's behalf; see Hunter (1989) 138 on the possibility that this passage might reflect a variant of the myth known to Apollonius. In any event, the Saurmatae (Sarmatians) do fight in Valerius' Colchian civil war against the Argonauts (V. Fl. 6.231–233), but their participation is a minor element in an extended narrative of civil war. It is very unlikely that the lost *Argonautica* of Varro of Atax had included such an episode; see Schenk (1999a) 12–13 n. 4. Perses appears as the brother of Aeetes in several accounts; Wijsman (1996) 142 notes that "the scholiast ad ARh 3.200 tells us that Dionysius of Miletus had in his *Argonautics* both Aeetes and Perses as sons of the Sun, the latter king of the Taurians; the same is found in Hyg. *Fab*. pr. 36 … and in Diod. Sic. 4.45, where Hecate is the daughter of Perses, murders her father and afterwards marries Aeetes to bear him two daughters, Circe and Medea. The same has Hyg. *Fab*. pr. 36 … Apollod. 1.9.1 lists as children of the Sun and Perseis Aeetes, Circe and Pasiphae, omitting Perses, whom in 1.9.28 he calls a brother to Aeetes. Such a tradition may be the source of VF's version [in which Aeetes and Perses are half-brothers on their mother's side]." Note that the "Dionysius of Miletus" cited on this point by the Apollonian scholiast should probably be identified with the Dionysius who is the source for Diodorus Siculus' version of the Argonautic story; see Rusten (1982) 65–76 and the detailed essay of Galli in this volume, pp. 137–151. Apollodorus is the only writer to make it explicit that Perses deprives Aeetes of his throne, and even there we find no hint that the Colchians at large took sides in this dynastic dispute. On the relationship between Valerius' narrative and its possible sources, see Fucecchi (1996) 106–113.

[2] Brothers: Conte (1994) 490; cf. McGuire (1997) 58–60; *Aeneid*: Conte (1994) 490; cf. Fucecchi (1996) 114–115; as Fucecchi (1996) 165 points out, the *Odyssey*, which also involves a war on arrival, is a relevant model too; *teichoscopia*: Fucecchi (1996) 164–165; Augoustakis (2013).

The literary tradition inherited by Valerius was divided on the question of whether or not the Argo was the first ship ever to sail, and around this division had developed two different ways of understanding the larger significance of the Argo's voyage. The Greek writers who treated the Argonautic legend before the third century BCE appear not to have regarded the Argo's sailing as the first sea voyage, a distinction that was usually reserved for the journey of Danaus from Egypt to Greece.[3] Apollonius follows in this tradition.[4]

The first writer to state without ambiguity that the Argo was the first ship is Eratosthenes, writing in the third century BCE.[5] This embellishment of the Argonautic story proved popular with the Latin poets, and it is picked up by Accius (*Medea* 391–394 Ribbeck),[6] by Catullus (64.1–7), by Ovid (*Am.* 2.11.1–6, *Her.* 12.16–17, *Met.* 6.721), and by Seneca (*Med.* 301–379, 579–669). For reasons that we shall explore below, the claim that the Argo was the first ship reacted with the longstanding Greek and Roman suspicion of seafaring to produce the idea that the Argo's voyage marked, in Denis Feeney's words, an "instant of rupture" between an innocent past and a corrupt present.[7]

Given the prominence of the first-ship tradition and its primitivist associations in Valerius' key Roman predecessors, it is surprising to observe the extent to which he deviates from the primitivist line.[8] Andrew Zissos has noted that the storm scene in the first book of the *Argonautica* encourages both a primitivist reading, in which the storm punishes the Argonauts for their daring, and a progressivist reading that identifies the wind-god Boreas, chief tormentor of the Argonauts, with the titanic forces of anarchy against which the new Olympian order sets itself.[9] Far from seeking to resolve this tension, the poem, Zissos argues, "constitutes a synchronic unity of heterogeneous or contradictory discourses."[10] Tim Stover has proposed

---

3 Jackson (1997) 251–252; Dräger (1999) 420–422.

4 See Jackson (1997) 249–251, with collection of references to prior seafaring in the poem. On possible Apollonian allusions to the claim that the Argo was the first ship, see Hunter (1989) 136.

5 Jackson (1997) 255.

6 That Accius here refers to the Argo as the first ship is evident from the context in which Cicero quotes him (*N. D.* 2.89); see Pease (1968) 769–773 and Thomas (1982) 158–160.

7 Feeney (2007) 118. See also Feeney (1991) 330–331.

8 For the term "primitivism" to refer to several ancient complexes of ideas about the superiority of past to present, see Lovejoy and Boas (1935), especially 1–22.

9 Zissos (2006a) 82–89.

10 Zissos (2006a) 95.

a bold optimistic reading of the poem that accepts the link between the Argo's mission and the destabilizing spread of civil war but suggests that Valerius views this instability as the necessary prelude to Roman power and the reign of Vespasian in particular.[11] Both Zissos and Stover proceed from the premise that Valerius regards the Argo as the first ship, but in different ways they both seek to weaken or negate the primitivist conclusions that might be assumed from this premise. This paper concentrates instead on an even more basic problem in Valerius' view of history, that of the Argo's very status as first ship. I propose that Valerius offers a unique reconciliation of the first-ship and Apollonian views of the Argo's place in human history and that he uses the question of civil war as his platform for doing so. The synthesis he works out accords the Argonauts themselves a perspective closely aligned with that of the Apollonian Argonauts, while reserving for the gods, the poet, and the reader full understanding of the place the heroes' activities have in the cosmic order. That understanding Valerius derives from the Latin first-ship tradition, but his unique contribution is in his subtle harmonization and articulation of the two ways of locating the Argo in history. As we shall see, this narrative strategy has the further effect of enunciating more precisely and sequentially the associations between the Argo's voyage and moral decline that characterize the first-ship tradition.

It is important to note, first of all, that Valerius never explicitly says that the Argo is the first ship. The passages commonly cited as implying this view can plausibly be interpreted in other ways.[12] The poem's opening, for example, could mean that the Argo is the first ship altogether, or it could mean that it is the first ship to sail the straits dividing Europe from Asia into the Black Sea, which is the historical role Apollonius accords the Argo.[13] Similarly, neither 1.211–214 (Mopsus says that Neptune is angered by their daring undertaking) nor 1.627–632 (the Argonauts take the storm in which they are caught as evidence for the wisdom of their forefathers'

---

11 Stover (2012) especially 27–77.

12 See the comprehensive list of such passages at Spaltenstein (2002) 24. I can discuss no more than a few of these here, but I have chosen those I consider most strongly indicative of the Argo's primacy, with the aim of suggesting Valerius' habitual evasiveness on the subject.

13 On Apollonius' Argo as the first ship to enter the Black Sea, see Jackson (1997) 257. The regular meaning of *freta* in poetry would be "sea," but surely an alert reader would be alive to the fact that the word could also mean "straits," perhaps with reference to the Hellespont and Bosporus.

avoidance of the sea) fully sustains the claim that Valerius believes the Argo to be the first ship; these passages could be taken to mean simply that the Argonauts themselves had not sailed before.[14] Nowhere does a narratorial or divine voice state unequivocally that the Argo's sailing is the first.[15] Instead, Valerius chooses at several key junctures to deepen his poem's ambiguity on this point.[16] The most egregious of these comes as he describes Hypsipyle's preservation of her father Thoas from her fellow Lemnian women:

> uisa ratis saeuae defecta laboribus undae
> quam Thetidi longinqua dies Glaucoque repostam
> solibus et canis urebat luna pruinis. (V. Fl. 2.285–287)

> She beheld a ship outworn with the toils of the savage sea, long since offered up to Thetis and to Glaucus, which passing time had scorched with its suns and the moon with her hoar-frosts had worn.

---

[14] Perhaps Valerius intends to leave the reader the option of subscribing to the older belief that Danaus' voyage from Egypt to Greece was the first sailing; the novelty involved in this voyage would then be the appearance of navigation in a sea (the Aegean) in which it was previously unknown. See, e.g., 2.445–446: *Thessala Dardaniis tunc primum puppis harenis / appulit et fatis Sigeo litore sedit* ("Then for the first time a Thessalian ship put in to the Dardanian strand and at fate's bidding rested on the shore of Sigeum"). These lines underscore the Argonauts' anticipation of, and priority to, the heroes of the Trojan War (Barnes [1981] 366), but we can also read them, with the emphasis on *Thessala*, qualifying *puppis*, as suggesting that the Argo's voyage was unprecedented not *tout court* but for a Thessalian vessel; cf. 1.276.

[15] Manuwald's (2009) 593 inference from 1.188–203 that "Jason is aware of the fact that he and his men will be crossing the open sea for the first time" depends on taking *inlicitas … uias* (1.197) as referring to the sea in general. This is not the only possible reading, though, especially since the phrase echoes *ignotas … uias* at *Aen*. 8.113 (Zissos [2008] 183), denoting new itineraries of exploration and settlement in a world where navigation was of course already widely employed. Sol's grievance (1.505–527) seems more concerned with where the ship is headed (to the realm of his son Aeetes) than with its novelty, to which he does not allude very plainly. Again, taking these passages to mean that Argo is the first ship is by and large the most natural reading, but Valerius' wording always leaves room for an alternative understanding.

[16] Cf. 2.108–109 (Lemnian men sail home from Thrace), 2.658 and 2.661 (a conversation between Cyzicus and Jason in which both remark on the propensity of the former's Pelasgian enemies for amphibious attack), and 7.260–262 (Venus, disguised as Circe and speaking to Medea, mentions in passing her habit of detaining sailors on her island). The latter reference in particular would seem at odds with "the 'resolution' of the issue at Diod. 4.41, which distinguishes between rudimentary short-range vessels that pre-date Argo, and long-range, wind-driven ships of which Argo is the prototype" (Zissos [2008] 73); cf. Plin. *Nat*. 7.207. A focus of ongoing controversy is 2.520: Liberman (1997) favors the humanist conjecture *ratis* over the *rates* of the manuscripts, so as to preserve the uniqueness of the Argo, while Poortvliet (1991) and Spaltenstein (2002) are untroubled by the plural.

The Lemnians seem to have been doing quite a lot of sailing, so much as to wear out their ships. Compare the parallel passage from Apollonius' account: λάρνακι δ' ἐν κοίλῃ μιν ὕπερθ' ἁλὸς ἧκε φέρεσθαι ("she put him in a hollow chest to be carried on the sea," A. R. 1.622). There is no mention of a ship at all here. Hypsipyle has simply repurposed a household container. Similarly, Valerius' contemporary Statius, recounting the same story in the *Thebaid*, makes no explicit mention of a ship (Hypsipyle is speaking):[17] *dein curuo robore clausum / dis pelagi Ventisque et Cycladas Aegaeoni / amplexo commendo patrem* ("then to the gods of the sea and the Winds and Aegaeon embracing the Cyclades I entrust my father hidden in curved timber," *Theb.* 5.287–289). The Valerian passage is sometimes explained by suggesting that the poet simply forgets that in his poem the Argo is supposed to be the first ship, but by comparison with Apollonius and Statius we can see that Valerius in fact goes out of his way to disrupt the first-ship understanding of the Argonauts' voyage and to draw attention to that disruption.[18] A better way to account for these apparent contradictions might be to suppose that they serve as a deliberately deployed means of self-differentiation from the Roman first-ship tradition, marking a partial and qualified turn back to the Apollonian model.[19]

Recent scholarship has tended to emphasize the extent to which Apollonius aligns the Argo's mission with the post-Alexandrian, and specifically Ptolemaic, extension of the boundaries of Greek space. For all of the moral ambiguity with which he invests the actions of Jason and Medea in particular, it is clear that for him the Argo's voyage brings in its train Greek civilization, viewed here as fundamentally progressive.[20] The sailing of the Argo and the epochal expansion of Greek power that it represents thus mark

---

17 I make no claim about the relative chronology of the two epics, though it seems likely that the *Argonautica* was in progress and in partial circulation by the time Statius began the *Thebaid* (see Dominik [1997] 29 n. 4 and Zissos [2006b] 166 n. 5) and that Statius' Lemnian episode in particular took Valerius' as one of its models. My suggestion is that Statius can show us the idiosyncrasies of Valerius' treatment; if Statius omitted those idiosyncrasies despite an overall dependence on Valerius, that case becomes so much the stronger.

18 Poortvliet (1991) 169: "Valerius has forgotten that the Argo was the only ship."

19 On the Roman epic poets' use of inconsistency to draw attention to important themes see O'Hara (2007), especially 34–41, and on Valerius' incorporation of rejected mythological variants into his poem, see Zissos (1999).

20 This is not to say that the poem does not challenge or complicate received ideas about the Greek-barbarian distinction; see Hunter (1991) and Thalmann (2011), especially 77–114. Rather the poem on the whole "work[s] to validate the expansion of the culture of the Greeks, who are depicted as noble, enlightened, and devoted to the cultivation of knowledge" (Mori [2008] 47).

an important change for the better.[21] There is little, if any, sign that Apollonius has embedded the story of the Argonauts within a Hesiodic framework of successive ages or races, most of them worse than their predecessors.[22] The association between the Argo's voyage and the spread of civilization not only mutes the link between seafaring and moral degeneracy but also sets out a moral chronology in which there is no need to explain intracommunal strife or betrayal. These are simply part of the background of uncivilized life against which the Argo's mission is thrown into relief. The poem is full of violence and deception, including between close relatives, but as Anatole Mori has pointed out, kin-murder is described in a curiously casual way and often attributed to mere accident.[23] It is not embedded in some larger historical scheme, and there is no suggestion that these phenomena are causally anchored in or driven by the Argo's voyage itself or an accompanying moral transition.[24]

For the Roman first-ship tradition, on the other hand, the Argo's sailing was an epochal event in human history, one that is both a sign of and itself an engine of moral decline. On this primitivist understanding of history, murder and betrayal of trust are deviations from the pristine order of things, and they must have a specific explanation and an identifiable beginning. Their advent is grounded in and symptomatic of the transition from a better age to a worse. In Seneca's *Medea*, the chorus connects the Argonauts'

---

21 Cf. Hunter (1993) 164: "The voyage stages a partial, constantly interrupted, movement towards 'order'. In the Alexandrian aesthetic of this poem, we should not expect to find a consistent, steady progression; rather, we must trace a thread through the epic which is sometimes visible, sometimes concealed."

22 Clauss (2000) 29 suggests some ways in which the epic might be orienting itself in the Hesiodic scheme, but even if one accepts his reading it remains true, as he remarks, that "Apollonius' poetic vision in the *Argonautica* does not include a Golden Age from which human beings came or to which they might one day return." This is the key fact about the Apollonian view of history for our purposes here.

23 Mori (2008) 212–215. Even the killing of Absyrtus (A. R. 4.452–481) receives scant remark, Apollonius's chief interest in the episode being in Jason and Medea's need for purification: Mori (2008) 209–210. Apollonius does rouse himself to a rare expression of personal sentiment for the occasion (A. R. 4.445–449; on the uniqueness of the passage see Fränkel [1968] 493) but his exclamation is an address to Eros, who is accorded timeless and ahistorical responsibility for human quarrels.

24 Clauss (2000) 25 lists some examples of treachery and deceit in the poem to argue that Apollonius shows us "a movement from the more primitive to the more civilized—physically, intellectually, and culturally—but with a concomitant movement from a more direct and honest, to a more disingenuous, code of morality," but the incidents he cites are not connected in the poem to any broader moral transition. Contrast the recurring practice of Valerius as described later in this article.

audacity in sailing over the seas with the greed and treachery unleashed by that innovation (*Med.* 301–379, 579–669, esp. 329–339). Seneca's treatment of this theme, and that of Catullus before him, participates in a wider tradition of assigning the invention of sailing an important role in the transition out of the Golden Age.[25] In both of these writers, the idea that the Argo was the first ship formed an attractive complement to the idea that seafaring is morally destructive.[26] The story of the Argo thus came to serve as a narrative hook on which to hang an exposition of human moral decline, represented by and to some extent having its origins in navigation. Not precisely a part of this tradition, but germane to any discussion of it, is Horace's *Carmen* 1.3, which does not name or allude to the Argo, but which identifies sailing with the infringement of natural boundaries in a way that was to have great influence on later treatments of the Argonautic myth. As Martha Davis has noted, Catullus, Horace, Ovid, and Seneca all use *audax* or related words in connection with the first voyage, and all suggest a strong link between that voyage and moral degeneration.[27] This tradition thus forms a part of a broader Roman pattern of simultaneous fascination with and repulsion from sea travel and the imperial and commercial activity it enabled, as Denis Feeney points out: "the concept of the wickedness of the ship, as a marker of a divorce from a happier primal state, derives much of its energy from this guilty consciousness of double-think."[28]

The major obstacle to assimilating Valerius to this Roman understanding of the Argo's role is that his poem shows us a world already marked by the violence that is absent from the standard picture of the Golden Age.[29] War between neighboring peoples is a long-established fact of life.[30] Valerius does not make the Argo's voyage, and the development of seafaring it represents, into the sole cause of all human ills, as does the chorus in Seneca's

---

25 The first writer to state unambigously that there is no sailing in the Golden Age is Aratus (*Phaen.* 110–111); on Aratus and the Aratean tradition, see Krasne and Castelletti in this volume, pp. 33–48 and 49–72 respectively. On the further development of this idea in Greek and Latin literature see the *conspectus rerum* s.v. *absentia nauium* in Gatz (1967) 229, and the references collected in Smith (1913) 245–247.

26 On the poetic and rhetorical expression of this theme see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 43–44, with further bibliography.

27 Davis (1989) 47.

28 Feeney (2007) 121.

29 See the *conspectus rerum* s.v. *absentia belli* in Gatz (1967) 229.

30 Among Greeks note that Aeson, who is a *senex* (1.349) has fought in wars (1.770). See discussion below of the Lemnians and Doliones, and, most notably, the war-speech of Gesander.

Medea. Rather, his poem's picture of history takes its bearings from the Hesiodic model, in which war, together with such other signs of the end of the Golden Age as the development of agriculture, precede the erosion of intracommunal trust that signals total depravity.[31] In this tradition, Valerius has available to him on the question of navigation in particular two models that show moral degeneracy advancing in a steady sequence, culminating in bloodshed within families, with seafaring assigned a late place in that sequence. The first of these models is the description of the ages of human history in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1.89–150). In this account, the silver race, whose rise coincides with the displacement of Saturn by Jupiter (*Met.* 1.113–114), is obliged by the new sovereign's introduction of seasons to farm the earth for its sustenance (1.123–124).[32] The bronze race is "readier" (*promptior*, 1.126) for war, the comparative suggesting that strife may not have been previously unknown. It is with the advent of the iron race that *pudor* and *fides* vanish (1.128–129). This age sees the beginning of navigation (1.132–134) and, concomitantly, the extinction of trust within families and among friends (1.144–150). The second key model for Valerius' location of navigation in human moral history is the speech in Seneca's *Phaedra* (483–558) in which Hippolytus counters the nurse's praise of civilized life (446–482). As part of his contrast between humanity's natural, happy state and its present squalid existence, Hippolytus sets out the steps in which this decline occurs. Originally there was no greed, no war, no sailing, and no agriculture (527–539). The impetus for the fall came from "impious passion for gain" (*impius lucri furor*, 540). From there followed, in succession, the lust for power (542–543), the development of weapons (545–551), the spread of warfare to the seas (552), and lastly violence within families (553–558).[33] In both Ovid's

---

31 Hes. *Op.* 118–119 (the golden race lives in peace); 134–135 (members of the silver race commit acts of violence against one another); 145–146 and 152–153 (the bronze race has a taste for violence and eventually destroys itself); 161–166 (the race of heroes destroyed in war); 182–201 (the age of the iron race will see the total extinction of trust and fellow-feeling even among those closely related). The idea that intrafamilial disharmony is the salient characteristic of the Iron Age is powerfully reinforced by the fact that the whole story of the races is embedded within a warning to the poet's brother, Perses, to desist from his quarrelsome ways (*Op.* 25–41). Incidentally, it does not seem far-fetched to think that Valerius has Hesiod's Perses in mind when he invents the story of Aeetes' quarrel with his brother of the same name. Sailing has no place in Hesiod's scheme of decline, though we learn elsewhere in the poem that sailing is unnecessary in the just community (*Op.* 236–237) and that in general Hesiod regards seafaring with wariness (649–650).

32 Cf. Virg. *G.* 1.121–146, discussed below.

33 On the differences between this sequence and that sketched by Ovid in *Met.* 1, see Grimal (1965) 96.

account and Seneca's, as in Hesiod's, the ultimate outrage is the destruction of familial ties, which long follows other forms of violence, and to which navigation is closely tied.[34]

Close examination of Valerius' poem, I argue, shows that he follows these models in connecting navigation with the advent of violence between kin and friends, against a background in which other forms of violence are already common.[35] The Colchian civil war, which not only tears the Colchian civil community asunder but also turns on murderous rancor between the brothers Aeetes and Perses, is the poem's preeminent example of violence among those bound by ties of *fides*, but as we shall see the theme is anticipated by events in Iolcus, on Lemnos, and in the land of the Doliones.[36] Valerius goes beyond his models, though, by making clear the causal relation between navigation and internecine strife. He does not simply associate the two but rather constructs his narrative to show the decisive role of seafaring in triggering violations of familial and social ties. It is through the medium of seafaring, and in particular the Argo's voyage, that Valerius is able to tie those violations clearly and directly to the new sovereignty of Jupiter, who announces himself as the motive force behind the voyage (V. Fl. 1.544–555).[37] In forging this immediate link between the accession of Jupiter and the rise of seafaring, Valerius is again giving causal precision to an association common in the work of his predecessors. The identification of the reign of Saturn with the Golden Age is widespread in Latin

34 Contrast the account given by Virgil in *Eclogue* 4: in that poem's palingenetic account of the return of the Golden Age, the voyage of the second Argo (*Ecl.* 4.34–35) occurs after the end of agriculture and the return of spontaneous plenty (18–20); the expedition is among the "few traces of old wickedness" (31) that will remain into the childhood of the poem's addressee. This sequence of events implies an account of humanity's moral decline in which—contrary to Ovid's and Seneca's accounts in the *Metamorphoses* and *Phaedra*, and, for that matter, to Aratus' in the *Phaenomena*—sailing, including the Argo's voyage, predates the introduction of agriculture.

35 In making this distinction between internally and externally directed violence, Valerius is also echoing a longstanding Roman moral distinction between *bellum ciuile* and *bellum externum*, on which see Jal (1963) 21–27. In the epic tradition this distinction is perhaps most powerfully articulated by Lucan (1.8–23).

36 On the recurring conflation of civil and intrafamilial violence in Roman literature and political discourse, see Jal (1963) 393–417. On the family in Flavian epic as a metonym for civil community, and vice versa, see Bernstein (2008). The intrafamilial dimensions of civil conflict are of course powerfully emphasized in the opening lines of both Lucan and Statius' *Thebaid*.

37 Jupiter's speech is a rich and complex piece of poetry, and its implications largely lie outside the scope of this article. See Wacht (1991); Manuwald (1999) 130–176; Stover (2012) 27–77.

authors (Virg. *Ecl.* 4.6, *Aen.* 8.319–327; Tib. 1.3.35–52; Ov. *Met.* 1.113–114, *Her.* 4.131–133). Already in Hesiod we find the golden race living under the rule of Cronus (*Op.* 111), though the contrast with the rule of Zeus is not explicit.[38] In none of the passages cited, though, is the causal relationship between the change of rule in heaven and the downward trajectory of human morality and living conditions given the clear development it is in Valerius' poem. The closest antecedent is the celebrated passage in Virgil's *Georgics* (1.121–146) in which Jupiter makes the world much more hazardous and taxing for mortals, a change that prompts the development of the arts including navigation (*G.* 1.137–138). The sequence of events by which Jupiter jolts humanity out of the Golden Age in the *Georgics*, though, is the reverse of the one this paper traces through Valerius' poem. Instead of creating other ills which are partially counteracted by the arts, the Valerian Jupiter directly prompts the development of navigation, which then engenders the dissolution of social and familial bonds.[39] In each instance of civil conflict, Valerius shows how the development of navigation radically exacerbates preexisting strains on those ties, allowing them to develop into full-fledged violence in a way that they would not have otherwise. The poem's view of history thus pivots on counterfactuality, as readers are repeatedly encouraged to imagine what would have happened in the absence of the causal impetus of the new connections among peoples enabled by the Argo's voyage. In this sense, Valerius' approach is deeply grounded in the Argonautic literary tradition (e.g., Eur. *Med.* 1–13). Like Euripides' nurse, the reader of Valerius' poem is impelled to think of what might have been had the Argo not sailed, and thereby to perceive the full extent of its significance in human history.

The scheme Valerius puts forward, though it represents an elaboration and refinement of the Latin first-ship tradition, nevertheless gives the Argo's sailing a place in history that is fundamentally congruent with the place

---

38 Zeus is in charge by the time of the silver race (*Op.* 138; cf. *Op.* 143) and decides the posthumous fate of the golden race (*Op.* 122), but the transition between the two reigns is not overtly linked to the change of race and age. On the background to the association between Cronus and the Golden Age, and its history in Greek literature after Hesiod, see Baldry (1952) 84–86.

39 Pallas takes an active part in this plan by supervising the construction of the Argo (V. Fl. 1.91–95), as she does in Apollonius (A. R. 1.19–20); see Krasne in this volume, pp. 33–48. Like the events leading up to the civil war, surveyed below, this intervention looks the same to its Argonautic observers in both poems but has a radically different significance in the context of the larger historical picture articulated by Valerius.

it is accorded in that tradition. He tacks towards the Apollonian model, though, by saving the phenomena of Apollonius' account at the level of the Argonauts' consciousness. That is, he gives them an understanding of their voyage's role in history that is in its essentials the same as that of the Apollonian Argonauts. This bifurcation is accomplished through a subtle narrative strategy that keeps the question of knowledge constantly in the foreground. Gesine Manuwald has noted that Valerius' poem enforces a consistent distinction between human and divine knowledge, with communication between gods and human beings structured in such a way as to leave the human characters oblivious to the true meaning of what is happening and is to happen.[40] We can extend this observation by proposing that Valerius shapes the information available to the Argonauts so as to occlude the role of their voyage in triggering civil war.

Valerius begins that shaping with the very start of the Argonauts' mission. Pelias tells Jason that Aeetes killed Phrixus, a story that is introduced by the narrator as a lie (*fictis … dictis*, 1.39):

> hunc ferus Aeetes, Scythiam Phasinque rigentem
> qui colit—heu magni Solis pudor!—, hospita vina
> inter et attonitae mactat sollemnia mensae
> nil nostri divumque memor. (V. Fl. 1.43–46)

> Him the savage Aeetes who dwells in Scythia and the frost-bound Phasis (alas! for the shame of the great Sun!), murdered amid the genial cups and ceremonial of the stricken banquet, mindful neither of me nor of heaven.

The truth, we later learn from the narrator (5.224–225), is that Phrixus died of old age in Colchis, and in general the Valerian Phrixus and his sons seem to enjoy an untroubled relationship with Aeetes.[41] By asserting that Aeetes killed Phrixus while serving as his host (1.44–45), Pelias suggests that infringement of hospitality is already something that happens, for no particular reason beyond general wickedness. That is, he encourages Jason to subscribe to a changeless and directionless vision of human moral history,

40 Manuwald (2009) 598. Cf. Ripoll (1998) 270–272, on Jason's apparent ignorance of his voyage's divine motivation.

41 See also Mitousi in this volume, pp. 157–158. Given the poem's global emphasis on the hitherto-uncrossed, except by Phrixus, distance between Thessaly and Colchis, we are probably meant to assume not that Pelias actually knows the peaceful circumstances of Phrixus' death and chose to misrepresent his end to Jason, but rather that he has no idea what became of Phrixus and simply makes up a suitably inflammatory story, complete with supposed warrant from Helle and the shade of Phrixus (1.49–50). On the role of Phrixus and his sons in both poems see Manuwald (2008).

entirely at odds with the story of radical upheaval and decline put forward by the poem's narratorial voice.[42]

In Apollonius' poem, this view of Aeetes and Colchis is the one with which Jason sets out, independently of any prompting from Pelias, presumably because it corresponds to the world in which he lives. Before he is anywhere near Colchis, and having received no information about Aeetes, Jason characterizes the Colchian king as "murderous" (ὀλοοῖο, A. R. 2.890).[43] This view is only partially dispelled when he comes into direct contact with the sons of Phrixus, one of whom assures him that Aeetes welcomed his late father hospitably and that Phrixus died of old age (2.1147–1151). When Jason explains to his men his plan to solicit the Fleece from Aeetes before attempting to use force, his contention that all men respect Zeus Xenios seems to rest on the report of Aeetes' reception of Phrixus (3.190–193), and even so Jason's estimate of Aeetes' potential hospitality seems low: witness his prediction that the effect of trying persuasion will be to expose Aeetes' "wickedness" (κακότητα, 3.182). The Valerian Jason, thanks to Pelias, thinks of Aeetes in the same way as the Apollonian Jason does before, and to a large extent even after, his meeting with the Phrixids. Valerius is kept from imposing full congruence on the Jasons' outlook in this respect by the impossibility of arranging a meeting between his Jason and the Phrixids, for such an encounter could not plausibly fail to expose to Jason the true origins of the Colchian civil war and thereby confound the double understanding of that event we have been tracking through the poem.

When the shade of Cretheus explains that the Argo's impending advent has triggered a civil war in Colchis, it is only to Aeson and Alcimede, for the Argonauts have already set sail:

> mitte metus, uolat ille mari, quantumque propinquat
> iam magis atque magis uariis stupet Aea deorum
> prodigiis quatiuntque truces oracula Colchos.
> heu quibus ingreditur fatis, qui gentibus horror
> pergit! (V. Fl. 1.741–745)

> Banish all fear! He is flying over the ocean, and as he draws ever nearer more and more does Aea marvel at the manifold miracles of heaven, and fierce Colchis is shaken by the prophecies. Alas! to what destinies does he move forward! His coming is the terror of nations!

[42] For some other ways in which Pelias' speech, marked as a lie, transmits alternatives to the "truth" of Valerius' fictional world, see Zissos (1999) 297–298.

[43] On the interpretation of this speech, see Hunter (1988) 447–448. Hunter argues, against previous readings, that the speech reflects Jason's actual (low) mood following the death of Tiphys, rather than a deliberate exaggeration of the gravity of the situation.

The links between the Argo's voyage and the beginning of the war in Colchis are thus made plain right away to the reader, but they never become clear to the Argonauts.

This pattern continues when the Argonauts receive their fullest glimpse of their voyage's place in history, the prophecy of Phineus. Both the Apollonian and the Valerian Phineus tell the Argonauts that Zeus or Jupiter has imposed limits on what can be revealed to human beings (A. R. 2.311–316; V. Fl. 4.559–560).[44] The Valerian Phineus' prophecy describes the Colchian civil war as follows:

> sic demum rapidi uenies ad Phasidis amnem.
> castra ibi iam Scythiae fraternaque surgit Erinys.
> ipse truces illic Colchos hostemque iuuabis
> auxiliis. nec plura equidem discrimina cerno. (V. Fl. 4.616–619)
>
> So at length you will come to rapid Phasis' stream; there already is a Scythian camp, and surging war between the brothers; you will help the fierce Colchians and your foe with your power. No further dangers do I see.

The key word here is *iam*, "already." Phineus presents the Colchian civil war to the Argonauts as a pre-existing state of affairs, independent of their voyage. Of the links between that voyage and the conflict in Colchis, the links of which the shade of Cretheus was so quick to apprise Aeson and Alcimede, Phineus says nothing. This omission preserves the congruence between the Valerian Argonauts' view of their voyage and that of their Apollonian predecessors; neither set of heroes believes that their voyage marks an epochal turning point for the fundamental conditions of human life, but only in Apollonius' poem is that outlook aligned with that of the narrator and the gods.

We are now in a position to examine the four major instances of intracommunal and intrafamilial conflict in the poem, culminating in the Colchian civil war. We will find that Valerius carefully situates each of these instances in a larger history of human moral decline, drawing attention in each case to the novel forces driving that decline. In each case, too, he shapes his narrative so as to preserve in the perspective of his Argonautic heroes a view of the world that is in its essentials congruent with that of the Apollonian Argonauts.

---

[44] Manuwald (2009) 594–604. Stover (2012) 164–170 places emphasis instead on the Valerian Jupiter's decision "to rescind his earlier injunction of silence" (166), but on both readings Jupiter is deciding what is to be revealed and what is not.

First we can examine the enmity between Pelias on the one hand and Aeson and Jason on the other. In Apollonius' poem, Pelias is warned that his fate is to be vanquished by someone he sees coming with one sandal (A. R. 1.5–7). In Valerius, by contrast, the prophecy given to Pelias simply designates his brother's son as the source of danger (V. Fl. 1.26–29). It is not even clear in Apollonius that Pelias knows of Jason's relationship to him when he dispatches him to seek the Fleece. In Valerius, Pelias issues the challenge on the basis of that relationship alone. Nevertheless, Valerius makes sure that Jason's experience—receiving the sudden charge to bring back the Fleece—remains the same in his poem as it is in Apollonius'. In neither version is Jason told the true reason why he is being sent to Colchis.[45] Valerius maintains the Apollonian phenomena, while unlike Apollonius he raises the question of intrafamilial violence explicitly. Valerius' treatment of this question, which as we shall see is typical, assigns Pelias' sinister intentions an origin exogenous to human politics, in the shape of the prophecies. Pelias does indeed fear Jason' renown and his "excellence, something never pleasing to a tyrant" (*uirtusque haud laeta tyranno*, 1.30). It is the conjunction of these fears with the repeated warnings of prophecy and the "threats of the gods" (*diuum minas*, 1.27), though, that prompts Pelias to action. Tyrannical hostility to excellence is put forward here as a general fact, but to yield intrafamilial violence that hostility needs to be activated by the intervention of the gods. We can thus see here the joint between two stages in humanity's moral decline, one in which there exists tyrannical government and the means for violence against family members and a more advanced one in which the gods impel that potential towards realization.

[45] Apollonius' poem is notoriously scant in its description of the motivation for the voyage more generally; see Beye (1982) 19–20. Valerius appears to feel that Jason would need some sort of explanation, so he supplies Pelias with the misleading speech discussed above about the importance of bringing the fleece back to Thessaly (1.40–57). The experience of the two Jasons might be held to differ in that the Valerian Jason is said to suspect personal animosity behind Pelias' commands (*nec uellera curae / esse uiro, sed sese odiis immania cogi / in freta*, 1.64–66). It is clear from the remarks of Alcimede in the Apollonian Jason's presence (A. R. 1.278–279), however, that he is under no illusions about Pelias' motives either (cf. A. R. 1.242–246, 2.624–626). As Hunter notes (1989) 135, "the only explicit reference in the poem to Pelias' desire to rob Jason of his patrimony" comes in Argus' speech to Aeetes (A. R. 3.333–336), presumably summarizing what he was told by Jason (Clare [2002] 115); this speech makes it clear that Jason is aware of Pelias' malign intent but, like Valerius' account, it contains no reference to the kinship between Pelias and Jason. Valerius' Jason, like Apollonius' Jason, has no inkling that Pelias means to harm him *because* he is a relative, despite the fact that the reader of Valerius' poem, unlike that of Apollonius', knows that such is Pelias' motive.

The next step in the causal sequence that culminates in Aeson's death comes when Pelias realizes that the Argonauts have set sail with his son Acastus among their number. As Zissos has pointed out, the entire description of the Argonauts' departure "systematically mirrors the end of the Dido episode at *Aen.* 4.361–5.34."[46] Among the correspondences identified is the echo of Dido's thought that she could have physically harmed Aeneas and Ascanius while they were in her power (*Aen.* 4.600–602) in Pelias' futile desire to stop the sailing by force (V. Fl. 1.700–703). The formal parallel between these two passages allows Valerius to highlight a striking difference between the two situations: in both cases the ruler is anguished by an expedition leaving his or her shores, but in the *Aeneid* Dido thinks back on what she might have been able to do had she acted in time, whereas Pelias actually mobilizes his forces to try to stop the Argonauts, only to be thwarted by the barrier of the sea. The impression of a sudden and unexpected check to armed action is strengthened by the comparison in the following lines (1.704–709) to the ineffectual attempts of Minos' forces to detain the escaping Daedalus and Icarus. Dido knows when she voices thoughts of harming Aeneas that she is by that time unable to put those plans into effect, for the concept of escape by sea is a familiar one to her, indeed an expedient that she has employed herself (*Aen.* 1.360–364). Pelias, on the other hand, does not quite understand how it works, and his inability to stop the Argonauts with all of his armed might leaves him as baffled and frustrated as the Cretans confronted by the spectacle of flight.[47]

It is this frustration that impels him to turn upon Aeson. After he realizes that the Argonauts are irrevocably beyond the reach of his power, thanks to their revolutionary means of locomotion, Pelias decides to pursue the one means of harming Jason still available to him, an attack on his father (V. Fl. 1.723–724). It is clear that Pelias and Aeson have never been on excellent terms, but the sailing of the Argo pushes Pelias to actual murderousness.[48] When Aeson receives word from the shade of Cretheus that Pelias plans to kill him, Aeson considers summoning the populace to his aid:[49]

---

46 Zissos (2008) xxxv.

47 The Virgilian echo Valerius deploys here is complemented by another likening of sailing to flight, that of Horace in *C.* 1.3, the final lines of which (38–40) implicitly conflate both activities with the Giants' attempt to reach the heavens. On parallels between sailing and flight in Valerius, see Krasne in this volume, pp. 40–42.

48 On the background of family disharmony implied in Valerius' poem, and Apollonius', but given fuller treatment in other versions of the myth, see Gantz (1993) 189–191.

49 On the contemporary resonance of the picture of Thessalian politics adumbrated here, see Zissos (2009) 356–357.

> ... ferrumne capessat
> imbelle atque aeui senior gestamina primi
> an patres regnique acuat mutabile uulgus. (V. Fl. 1.759–761)
>
> Is he to seize a feeble sword? Shall he in old age wield the weapons of early youth? Shall he stir up the elders and the fickle folk of the kingdom?

His dilemma recalls Jason's parallel quandary earlier in the book: *populumne leuem ueterique tyranno / infensum atque olim miserantes Aesona patres / aduocet* ("Shall he summon to his aid a fickle populace, already girding at their aged lord, and the elders that have long since pitied Aeson?" 1.71–73). In the end, neither Jason nor Aeson opts for armed defiance of Pelias. Different considerations deflect them from the course of civil war, though, and that divergence is instructive. Jason's dilemma is resolved internally, as his doubts about how to answer Pelias' challenge are settled by his own "trust in heaven" (*religio*, 1.80). He needs no external check to keep him from civil war. Aeson, however, reaches no such decision on his own. Instead, his deliberation is arrested by the intervention of Alcimede, who insists on sharing his fate (1.763–766). After her speech, he abandons his half-baked plans for insurrection and turns to considering how he might most fittingly kill himself (1.767–770). Aeson's thoughts of civil war, then, require unlike Jason's a countervailing outside force to repress them.[50] This contrast inverts what we might expect, since Jason is the younger and more readily prepared for war of the two.[51] Valerius thus makes us locate Aeson's relatively greater openness to civil war simply in the fact that his deliberations come at a more advanced stage of the causal chain inaugurated by the Argo's construction and ultimately by the accession of Jupiter. The Colchian civil war, like the embryonic Thessalian conflict a dispute between two brothers, is another iteration of the same pattern. The turmoil in Colchis, though chronologically prior to at least Aeson's consideration of civil war, issues from an even more radical disruption by navigation of the pre-existing political situation, and consequently that turmoil, unlike its Thessalian analogues, erupts into actual civil war. Valerius does not tell us exactly what considerations kept Aeetes and Perses from attacking one another before the struggle over the question of yielding the Fleece to the Argonauts, any more than he tells us

---

[50] Ripoll (1998) 379–380, praises the public-spiritedness of Aeson's choice, but as he himself notes (380), Aeson's thoughts are deflected away from civil war only after Alcimede's imploring interruption.

[51] Aeson's unreadiness for war is highlighted by the mention of his *ferrum ... imbellum* (1.759–760).

why Pelias never has tried to kill Aeson before Jason absconds with Acastus, but whatever those considerations were, they are shown to be inadequate in the face of the new pressures brought to bear by the development of sailing. The language of Cretheus' prophecy, in which Colchis' troubles prove more and more severe the further the Argo progresses on its mission (1.742), explains also why neither of the potential civil wars in Thessaly reaches actuality. As the Argo will come back to Greece, though, so too will the internecine conflict it brings in its train, foreshadowed in Aeson's vindictive dying wish that Pelias be killed by those closest to him (1.812–814).[52] By the historical logic of the poem, the intrafamilial bloodshed in Thessaly conspicuously averted in the first book must await for its realization the final stage of the Argo's mission.

The upheaval on Lemnos is the next instance of civil strife in the poem. Valerius situates the Lemnian women's killing of their husbands in a causal chain that begins with Jupiter's accession to power: his pique at the other gods' resentment of his new suzerainty (2.83) leads him to hang Juno from the sky, which in turn leads to Vulcan's attempts to assist her, to Vulcan's being cast to earth and landing on Lemnos, to the special bond between him and the Lemnians, to the Lemnians' shunning of Venus after her adultery with Mars comes to light, and then to Venus' vengeance in goading the Lemnian women towards the slaughter (2.82–106 and 115–134). By contrast, Apollonius' account begins only with the Lemnians' neglect of Aphrodite and her consequent wrath (A. R. 1.614–615).[53] Valerius' version, unlike that of Apollonius, links the outbreak of intrafamilial violence on Lemnos to Jupiter's rise to power, the same event that is the causal driver of the Argo's voyage.

Apollonius' version does not assign the Lemnian bloodbath any place in an unfolding and sequential cosmic history. It thus leaves the impression that the violence of the Lemnian women against their men is not a novel horror, an indication of growing human depravity, but rather an ordinary

---

[52] Valerius here alludes to the common story that Medea, once arrived in Iolcus, induced Pelias' own daughters to kill him: Gantz (1993) 191 and 365–367. Hershkowitz (1998) 10–13, speculates that Valerius may have intended these events to mark the close of his poem.

[53] Statius follows Apollonius in this respect (*Theb.* 5.57–59). This is Hypsipyle's own account of events, but it seems based on the appearance to her and Thoas of the latter's father Bacchus, whose explanation of what has happened (5.271–284) implicates the Fates and Jupiter only inasmuch as they have allowed full scope to the rage of Venus (5.277). This rage is not here given the causal grounding in the succession of Jupiter Valerius supplies. On Statius' heroine, see Soerink in his volume, pp. 171–191.

instance of violence in a violent world. Aphrodite makes the women repulsive to their husbands, but she does not actively incite them to murder as Venus does in Valerius' poem.[54] In the latter poem we are in a world in which violence among those tied together by blood or trust does not simply happen but is tied in some causal way to Jupiter's unfolding plan. In this case, the Lemnian massacre stems from the coincident action of two different causal chains stemming from Jupiter's new mastery. One is the tie between Vulcan and Lemnos already mentioned, and the other is the new prominence of sea travel. Though there are signs, as discussed above, that Lemnos has been home to an active culture of navigation for some time prior to the massacre, it is nevertheless clear that the massacre is triggered by the new use of sailing for war and plunder. In Valerius' account, there is no indication that the Lemnian men were ever repulsed by their wives, as in Apollonius.[55] Indeed, when they bring back captives from Thrace, their chief thought seems to be of the ways in which these captives will ease the lot of their wives, presumably through helping with domestic chores (V. Fl. 2.113–114).

Valerius here continues his project of filling in the causal sequence by which humanity enters the Iron Age. Here we see how war with peoples over the sea, coupled with the navigational technology that enables such war and permits its spoils to be brought home, issues in conflict within the family and the city. Venus times her assault for the day the captives are brought back from Thrace. It is their very foreignness and unfamiliarity that enables her to achieve the results she does.[56] Repeatedly she uses the markers of the Thracian women's difference to inflame the Lemnian women against

---

54 Venus spurs Fama to diffuse false reports about the intentions of the returning Lemnian men (V. Fl. 2.115–134). She then assumes successively the guise of two different Lemnian woman and spreads further inflammatory rumors herself (2.141–165, 174–187), and she personally leads the Lemnian women in killing their husbands (2.196–215). Of course, the influence of Juno's instigation in the seventh book of the *Aeneid* of war between the Trojans and the Latins, itself a sort of civil war in that it pits Latinus against Amata (*Aen.* 7.341–407; cf. Bernstein [2008] 55), is apparent here.

55 Rumors of the Lemnian men's infidelity spread by Venus generate hostility among their wives (see previous note), with no narratorial confirmation that those rumors have any grounding in fact. For further discussion and contrast with Apollonius' treatment of this point, see Dominik (1997) 32.

56 See her references to the purportedly outlandish appearance and customs of the Thracian captives at 2.150 and 2.156–159. It is difficult to imagine that the Lemnian women actually know what a Thracian woman would look like, and it is precisely this gap that Venus fills with her lurid sketch. The Lemnian women's combination of previous ignorance of other peoples with sudden, jarring exposure, made possible by seaborne raiding, is what makes Venus' offensive successful.

them and against their own husbands. It is the presence, or even prospective presence, of foreign women on Lemnos that opens up a space for homicidal jealousy between spouses who, unlike their Apollonian equivalents, knew no previous estrangement.

In a pattern that we will find repeated, though, Valerius is careful to limit to the first level of the narrative his assignment of a particular place in the story of human moral decline to the events on Lemnos. At the level of the characters' experience, he does not on this score deviate from the pattern established by Apollonius. Like the Apollonian Argonauts, Jason and his band in Valerius' account are well-received on Lemnos through the intervention of Venus / Aphrodite (V. Fl. 2.328), though unlike in Apollonius' account (A. R. 1.851), her good offices are not ascribed to any desire to do a favor for Vulcan / Hephaestus, since by the very premise of the Valerian story the goddess' antagonism to the islanders derives from their excessive loyalty to her husband. Valerius' deviation from Apollonius here makes no difference to the characters' experience, since they do not know that Venus is favoring their entry to the city, much less from what motives she might be doing so. The course of the Argonauts' stay on and departure from Lemnos then follows the Apollonian pattern.[57] As so often in Valerius' poem, the Argonauts experience a world congruent with that shown in Apollonius' poem, while the reader is shown the ways in which that experience is grounded in a larger explanatory scheme radically at odds with Apollonius' account.

The clash between the Argonauts and the Doliones reiterates the pattern yet again: the reader is shown how the conflict derives from the epochal changes afoot, while the Argonauts are insulated from that knowledge. The accidental slaughter of Cyzicus, the king of the Doliones, is figured in both poems as a sort of civil war by the description of the ties of hospitality that bind the Doliones and Argonauts (A. R. 1.961–963; V. Fl. 2.646–647, 2.649–650, 3.13–14, 3.18–19), but these ties receive more emphasis in Valerius' poem.[58] In Apollonius' account, no god is said to be responsible for the fatal misunderstanding; in Valerius, it comes as Cybele's revenge for Cyzicus' slaying, and subsequent brazen display, of a lion in her service (3.20–26). She

[57] See Poortvliet (1991) 65–69, for a detailed comparison of Valerius' Lemnian narrative with those of Apollonius and Statius.

[58] See further McGuire (1997) 108–113 and Stover (2012) 117–125. The Cyzicus episode foreshadows and shows close structural similarities to the full-scale civil war in Colchis (Fucecchi [1996] 120–121).

plots "new horrors and new killings" (*noua monstra … noua funera*, 3.29) for him.[59] Her machinations, though, are only able to come to fruition through the inherent limitations of navigation, as the Argo, its helmsman Tiphys lured to sleep, drifts back to the Doliones' shore (3.32–45). This description of how the Argo comes to return to the land of the Doliones, unlike the parallel passage in Apollonius (A. R. 1.1015–1025), places the responsibility on Tiphys; here as in Seneca's *Medea* he serves to personify the art of sailing, in all its rashness and exposure to epistemic hazard.[60] Apollonius distributes blame between the winds (A. R. 1.1016–1017) and the confusion of the Argonauts once they have made landfall (A. R. 1.1021–1022). Valerius, though, makes the sea the setting for the entirety of the Argonauts' error; the sentries sound the alarm before they are even ashore (3.45).[61] His account makes it clear that the Argonauts could never have ended up fighting Cyzicus and his people were it not for their characteristic mode of locomotion's unique potential to generate confusion. Valerius emphasizes this potential by calling the waters near the home of Doliones "known shallows" (*notis … uadis*, 3.43) as he describes the Argo's drift back into them. The Argonauts have visited these waters before, but they do not in fact know or recognize them, and the irony involved in calling them *notis* draws attention to the inevitable incompleteness and uncertainty of the seafarer's knowledge, at the same time highlighting the disjunction between what the reader knows and what the characters know.

As in the Lemnian episode, the new order marked by and to some extent opened by the Argo's voyage opens up possibilities not for war itself, which is already familiar to the Doliones (2.655–662), but a particular kind of war, that between friends—the *impia bella* fought by *socias manus* that Cybele plans (3.30). This causal link is emphasized for the reader, both in the description of the Argo's return and in the narrator's comment on the fate of Cyzicus and his Doliones:

> scilicet haec illo iuuenem populosque manebant
> tempore, Peliacis caderet cum montibus arbor:
> hoc uolucrumque minae praesagaque fulmina longo
> acta mari tulerant. sed quis non prima refellat
> monstra deum longosque sibi non auguret annos? (V. Fl. 3.352–356)

59 This divine causality, amplified by the participation of Pan (V. Fl. 3.46–57), never becomes apparent to the Argonauts. On the role of the gods in this episode, see Manuwald (1999) 177–196.

60 Cf. also Neptune's particular anger towards Tiphys at 1.649–650.

61 On Cyzicus' sentries as the source of the alarm, see Spaltenstein (2004) 19.

> In very truth this fate was laid up for prince and people, what time the trees fell on the Pelian mount; this fate had threatening birds and presaging thunder-brands borne far overseas announced. But who is not fain to reject heaven's earliest omens and prophesy for himself long years to come?

The internecine conflict that kills Cyzicus is part of the unfolding of a causal sequence that begins with the launch of the Argo, but once again Jason and his band are insulated from this knowledge. Jason bewails his own and Cyzicus' misfortune at some length (3.290–313), and he identifies the gods as the source of this misfortune (3.300–301),[62] but unlike the poem's narrator, he never draws any connection between these misfortunes and the novelty of his mission. He remains unable to perceive the place of that mission in the broader sweep of human history and unable to trace its ramifications in the instances of civil disorder with which he is repeatedly confronted.

This pattern is repeated on a larger scale in Valerius' account of the civil war at Colchis. He shows us that war is integral to the way the peoples the Argonauts encounter there understand their own identity.[63] We can see the bellicosity of trans-Euxine life most clearly in the battlefield boast delivered by the Iazygian king Gesander (6.323–339). Unlike Numanus Remulus, the Italian warrior who delivers the Virgilian model for this speech (*Aen.* 9.598–620), Gesander specifically dissociates his people from seafaring (V. Fl. 6.326–327) and fortified towns (6.329–330), two common indices of descent into the Iron Age.[64] On the other hand, he boasts that the Iazygians delight in war and plunder (6.338–339). We might take this speech as Valerius' portrait of what life in this part of the world was like before navigation entwined its fate with that of far-flung peoples, just as Numanus Remulus gives us a picture of an Italian way of life on the verge of being changed irrevocably, for better and worse, by the arrival of the Trojans.[65] The effect of the prophecies that trigger the war in Colchis is to turn this ferocity from its outward targets to within the civil community and even the family.[66]

---

62 Even in this respect Jason's understanding is incomplete, since he blames Apollo and Jupiter (3.299), rather than the real culprit, Cybele.

63 Indeed, the Fleece has been deposited in a grove sacred to Mars (5.251), who takes the Colchian side as conflict with the Argonauts looms (5.624–648).

64 For fortifications as a sign of moral decline, see Virg. *Ecl.* 4.32–33.

65 Gesander's speech, with its glimpse of the lands beyond the Black Sea before the incursion of the Argonauts, hardly impairs their narrative insulation, since his only named listener is the hapless Canthus, whom he promptly kills (6.341–342). On the "stark and original portrait of primitive Italy" given in the Virgilian speech, see Horsfall (1971) 315.

66 This is not to deny that Valerius assigns to Aeetes responsibility for how he responds to Phrixus' warning and the priest's demand, as Baier (1998) 324 argues he does, but rather

When Aeetes explains the war to the Argonauts, Valerius has him pass over the causal connection between the conflict and their mission. Instead, he blandly informs them that "all men have such lust for power" (*sceptri sic omnibus una cupido*, 5.536). Later, Perses, understandably piqued that the Argonauts have chosen to fight for Aeetes when it is he, Perses, who advocated giving them the Fleece and Aeetes who insisted on retaining it, prepares to send an embassy to the Argonauts and apprise them of the war's true history:

> se primum Haemoniis hortatum ea uellera terris
> reddere et exuuias pecudis dimittere sacrae:
> hinc odium et tanti uenisse exordia belli. (V. Fl. 6.18–20)

> It was he that first advised Aeetes to restore the Fleece to Haemonia and let go the slough of the sacred beast; hence hatred and the prelude of a mighty war.

Just as Perses' envoys are about to depart, though, Mars incites an immediate beginning to the battle (6.26–30). By showing Perses almost, but not quite, succeeding in alerting the Argonauts to their true place in the story of the Colchian civil war, Valerius foregrounds the gulf between what the heroes know, on the one hand, and what the reader and many of the other characters know on the other. The Argonauts' experience of Colchis remains fundamentally congruent with that of the Apollonian Argonauts, despite the civil war in which they become enmeshed. In fact, as I have demonstrated, that civil war provides Valerius with his major platform for achieving a synthesis between the Apollonian and first-ship accounts of the Argo's place in history. In examining the narrative strategies used to maintain this synthesis, and the bifocal perspective on the Argo's role it requires, we can arrive at a new appreciation both for the durable appeal of Apollonius' poetic vision and for Valerius' skill in subsuming it within his own.

---

to emphasize that the poem does not allow us to suppose that the tensions evidently pre-existing in Colchis would have erupted into war in the absence of the portents connected with the Argonauts' imminent arrival.

DIONYSIUS SCYTOBRACHION'S *ARGONAUTICA* AND VALERIUS

Daniela Galli

Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* is closely linked to the Greek past: the story of the Argonauts and their quest for the Golden Fleece is one of the oldest Greek myths and the topic of numerous Greek works. The best-known poetic version of this myth, Apollonius' Hellenistic *Argonautica* is generally recognized as Valerius' immediate predecessor and model,[1] even though the Roman poem differs greatly from its Greek counterpart.

Scholars, however, have noted that Valerius is also clearly indebted to other authors who have treated the same myth: for instance, Valerius' poem reveals a close contact with the tale of the Argonautic expedition as narrated by the Greek historian Diodorus Siculus in the fourth book (40–56) of his *Bibliotheke* (*Library*). Common themes between the two were first pointed out by Thilo,[2] who supports the view that Valerius makes use of the historian as one of his sources. Subsequently, the relationship between Valerius and Diodorus was further studied by Edward Schwartz,[3] according to whom we must assume that both Valerius and Diodorus draw from a common source: since the Greek mythographer Dionysius Scytobrachion is generally[4] indicated as the source for other mythological sections of Diodorus' *Library* as well as for the tale of the Argonautic expedition in the fourth book, we can assume that Scytobrachion must have served also as Valerius' source.

---

[1] See, e.g., Harmand (1898).

[2] Thilo (1863) vii–xii.

[3] Schwartz (1880).

[4] Diodorus refers directly to Dionysius Scytobrachion as his source in his account of the Amazons in the third book (Diod. Sic. 3.52.3). Dionysius Scytobrachion is generally recognized as Diodorus' source also for his tale of the Argonauts: see Heyne (1893) lxvii; Rusten (1982) 12–16; Ambaglio, Landucci, and Bravi (2008) 29: "… Dionisio Skytobrachion, un grammatico del II sec. a.C. che conosciamo quasi esclusivamente grazie a Diodoro, il quale lo utilizza nei libri III e IV per la leggenda degli Argonauti"; Mariotta and Magnelli (2012) 172. See also Constantakopoulou (2010) 72: "Although Diodoros refers to Dionysios in his account of the Amazons, he does not name Dionysios as his source in his version of the Argonauts' story … Diodorus is perfectly capable of using as a source an author whom he named in an earlier passage, and it is most likely that his main source here, as in the Libyan Stories, is Dionysios's *The Argonauts*."

The *Suda* informs us that Dionysius the Mytilenean, also called Scytobrachion, wrote a prose version of the Argonautic myth. This work most certainly contained six books, while the Scholia to Apollonius refer to the number of books as two.[5] In his study on Dionysius Scytobrachion, Rusten suggests that the reference in the Suda is probably accurate, as the Scholia to Apollonius' poem are not necessarily trustworthy in this respect.[6] Dionysius Scytobrachion's work has been dated in the late second century BCE, based on Suetonius' attestation in *De grammaticis*,[7] but this dating must be reviewed in light of recent papyrological discoveries: according to *P. Hibeh* 2.186 of the late third century, which can be identified as one manuscript of Dionysius' *Argonautica*, he would probably have lived in the third century, from 270–220 BCE.[8] As we can infer from this, Dionysius Scytobrachion wrote his *Argonautica* at about the same time as Apollonius Rhodius: Scytobrachion's *Argonautica*, however, as we know it from Diodorus and the newly discovered papyrus, does not owe anything to Apollonius'. Some scholars believe that Dionysius Scytobrachion was not acquainted with Apollonius' poem,[9] but others do not exclude the possibility that there is a mutual influence on one another.[10] According to some scholars it seems more likely that Apollonius' epic was intended as a response to Dionysius Scytobrachion's version.[11]

---

5 See Constantakopoulou (2010). According to the *Suda*, Dionysius Scytobrachion' *Argonautica* were made up by six books, but the Scholia mention only a first and a second book, and one of the quotations from the second book has to do with the Argonauts' voyage back from Colchis. On these problems, see Hachtmann (1865).

6 Rusten (1982) 77–79.

7 Suet. *Gram.* 7: *M. Antonius Gnipho, ingenuus in Gallia natus sed expositus, a nutritore suo manumissus institutusque—Alexandriae quidem, ut aliqui tradunt, in contubernio Dionysii Scytobrachionis, quod equidem non temere crediderim, cum temporum ratio uix congruat …* ("Marcus Antonius Gripho was born free in Gaul but was exposed; the man who claimed and raised him gave him his freedom and saw to his education—at Alexandria, as some report, in close association with Dionysius Scytobrachion, though I for my part should not be quick to believe it, since the chronology is scarcely correct").

8 220 BCE is considered the *terminus ante quem*, because of the date of *P. Hibeh*. 2.186, and 270 BCE is indicated as the *terminus post quem*, because Apollodorus and Pausanias used Dionysius' work and further because of an indirect reference in the fragments from his "Lybian Stories" to the Ptolomaic cult of the θεοὶ ἀδελφοί, Ptolemy Philadelphos and Arsinoe the Second.

9 Jackson (2003) 124.

10 Hunter (1989) 20; Cameron (1995) 296 with note n. 19; Stephens (2003) 40. See also Cartledge, Garnsey, and Gruen (1997) 34–71; Green (1997) 32–36.

11 Nelis (1991).

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that, in addition to Apollonius, Valerius Flaccus knows Dionysius Scytobrachion's version of the *Argonautica* and that he exploits both accounts to construct his own narrative. To that effect, I shall analyze three cases where Valerius prefers to follow Dionysius' version rather than that of Apollonius.

1. *The First Book*[12]

That Valerius prefers Dionysius Scytobrachion's version rather than Apollonius' seems true especially in the first book of the Flavian poem. Valerius follows Dionysius because the latter's account offers him an interesting starting point for developing more contemporary themes, in order to overcome the disengaged extraneity of an ancient myth, such as the Argonautic saga.

While Apollonius limits himself to a brief report of the antecedents of the expedition in the first book of his *Argonautica* (A. R. 1.5–17), at the beginning of his poem Valerius (V. Fl. 1.22–37) insists in outlining the character of Pelias and explains extensively the reasons that make him send Jason to Colchis. In this section of the first book of his poem, Valerius seems to have much in common with Diodorus, who draws from Dionysius Scytobrachion. First of all, Valerius explains that Pelias rules Thessaly (*Haemoniam*[13] *primis Pelias frenabat ab annis*, "from his earliest years Pelias had ruled Haemonia," V. Fl. 1.22). The designation of Pelias as king of the Thessalians does not belong to the Argonautic tradition as testified by Apollonius, but it is common to Diodorus: Πελίου τοῦ Θετταλῶν βασιλέως ("of Pelias king of the Thessalians," Diod. Sic. 4.40.1 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby). Valerius then emphasizes that Pelias is afraid of his nephew Jason because the auspices and the oracles indicate that he is the designated successor, destined to kill Pelias and seize power (V. Fl. 1.26–29). To describe Jason in this section of his poem, Valerius uses only the periphrasis[14] that points to Jason's kinship with Aeson, Pelias' brother: *fratrisque ... / progeniem* ("his brother's offspring," 1.26–27); *iuuenemque ... / Aesonium* ("the son of Aeson," 1.31–32). In such a way, the poet reveals that Pelias is afraid of his nephew because

---

[12] For a more detailed analysis of the sources used by Valerius in the first book of the *Argonautica*, see Galli (2005).

[13] Even though strictly designating only the area known as Pelasgiotis, *Haemonia* is a frequent name substitute for Thessaly in Roman poetry; cf., e.g., Sen. *Med.* 720.

[14] See, for instance, *fratrisque paventi / progeniem*; ("dread of his brother's offspring," 1.26–27) and *iuuenemque extinguere pergit / Aesonium* ("to destroy the son of Aeson," 1.31–32).

he could reclaim the scepter,[15] since in fact Valerius alludes to the tradition that Pelias becomes king of Thessaly only by usurping the throne from Aeson: *populumne leuem ueterique tyranno / infensum atque olim miserantes Aesona patres / aduocet?* ("Shall he summon to his aid a fickle populace, already girding at their aged lord, and the elders that long since have pitied Aeson?" 1.71–73). In such a way Valerius deliberately distances himself from the ambiguity of the oracle as presented by Apollonius, which explains that Pelias should be afraid of a man wearing just one sandal (A. R. 1.5–11), while at the same time the Flavian poet comes closer to Diodorus' account, who draws from Dionysius Scytobrachion. In fact, from the beginning of his tale of the expedition, the historian explains that Pelias' willingness to kill his nephew Jason is motivated by the fact that he recognizes in Jason the man able to take away his power and bring it back to his brother's family: Πελίου … ὡς ἐλπίζοντος ἐν τοῖς παραβόλοις στρατείαις διαφθαρήσεσθαι. αὐτὸν μὲν γὰρ ἐκ φύσεως ἐστερῆσθαι παίδων ἀρρένων, τὸν δὲ ἀδελφὸν εὐλαβεῖσθαι μήποτε συνεργὸν ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν ἐπίθηται τῇ βασιλείᾳ ("As Pelias was hoping that in the hazardous expedition he would die; for he himself had been deprived by nature of any male children and he was apprehensive of his brother that he, with his son as accomplice, would make a move against his kingship," Diod. Sic. 4.40.2–3 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby).

The reasons for Pelias' concerns indicated by Valerius are the same as in Diodorus' version. The Flavian poet remarks that Jason's aspirations for *uirtus* and *fama* trouble Pelias, turning him into a victim and prisoner of fear (V. Fl. 1.29–30). Likewise Diodorus represents Jason as full of manliness and loved by all his subjects: ῥώμῃ δὲ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς λαμπρότητι διενέγκαντα τῶν ἡλικιωτῶν ("he was excelling in the strength of his body and the splendor of his spirit above those of his years," Diod. Sic. 4.40.1 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby).

Then Valerius introduces Pelias' speech to Jason, by which he persuades the young man to sail to Colchis (V. Fl. 1.38–57). Such a dialogue between Pelias and Jason is not mentioned by Apollonius in the first book of his poem, but it has instead a parallel in Diodorus' tale, drawn from Dionysius Scytobrachion: κρύπτοντα δὲ τὴν ὑποψίαν ταύτην, καὶ τὰ πρὸς τὴν στρατείαν χρήσιμα χορηγήσειν ἐπαγγειλάμενον, παρακαλεῖν ἆθλον τελέσαι στειλάμενον τὸν πλοῦν εἰς Κόλχους ἐπὶ τὸ διαβεβοημένον τοῦ κριοῦ δέρος χρυσόμαλλον ("hiding,

15 On the political nature of the conflict between Pelias and Jason in Valerius' poem, see Galli (2002).

however, this suspicion, and promising to supply all that was needed for the expedition, he urged Jason to accomplish a labor by outfitting a voyage to Colchis for the notorious Golden Fleece of the ram," Diod. Sic. 4.40.3 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby). Valerius notes Pelias' willingness to hide his true intentions in such a conversation, too: *tum iuuenem tranquilla tuens nec fronte timendus / occupat et fictis dat uultum et pondera dictis* ("then facing the youth with calm countenance and anger banished from his brow, he first accosted him, and his look lent weight to his lying words," V. Fl. 1.38–39).

Later in the first book of Valerius' *Argonautica*, we find other common elements with Diodorus' tale, when Valerius presents Jason in doubt whether or not to undertake the enterprise:

> mox taciti patuere doli nec uellera curae
> esse uiro, sed sese odiis immania cogi
> in freta. qua iussos sectatur quaerere Colchos
> arte queat: nunc aerii plantaria uellet
> Perseos aut currus et quos frenasse dracones
> creditus, ignaras Cereris qui uomere terras
> imbuit et flaua quercum damnauit arista.
> heu quid agat? populumne leuem ueterique tyranno
> infensum atque olim miserantes Aesona patres
> aduocet an socia Iunone et Pallade fretus
> armisona speret magis et freta iussa capessat,
> siqua operis tanti domito consurgere ponto
> fama queat. tu sola animos mentemque peruris,
> Gloria, te uiridem uidet immunemque senectae
> Phasidis in ripa stantem iuuenesque uocantem. (V. Fl. 1.64–78)

> Soon was his secret guile laid bare, and it was plain to Jason that the king did not care for the Fleece, but that by his hate alone he himself was driven forth to the terrible seas. Yet how to obey? How to set out in the quest of Colchis? Had he but Perseus' winged sandals now or the car and the fabled team of dragons of him who first set the mark of the plow upon lands that did not know Ceres and preferred the golden ear to the acorn. Alas! What is he to do? Shall we summon to his aid a fickle populace, already girding at their aged lord, and the elders that long since have pitied Aeson? Or shall he trust rather to the aid of Juno and Pallas of the ringing armor and launch forth at the king's command, if with the sea subdued some renown could arise from so great a task? You, Glory, you alone fire man's heart and mind! He beholds you fresh, untouched by time, standing upon the shore of Phasis, calling to the young heroes.

Such a moment of hesitation has no parallel in Apollonius' first book, but it is present in Diodorus' account, who is probably summarizing his source Dionysius Scytobrachion (Diod. Sic. 4.40.5 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14

Jacoby). As Schwartz has pointed out, Jason compares himself to Perseus and the other heroes who acquired glory and fame for themselves by accomplishing highly dangerous feats (V. Fl. 1.67–70),[16] and as such his portrayal agrees with Diodorus' version where Jason hopes to acquire glory by accepting the enterprise imposed to him by Pelias: ὁρῶντα δὲ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ Περσέα καί τινας ἄλλους διὰ τὰς ὑπερορίους στρατείας καὶ τὸ παράβολον τῶν ἄθλων δόξης ἀειμνήστου τετευχότας, ζηλῶσαι τὰς προαιρέσεις αὐτῶν ("and since he noticed that of the men before him, Perseus and some others, because of their campaigns in foreign lands and the hazardous state of their labors, had achieved everlasting fame, he was eager to follow their examples," Diod. Sic. 4.40.2 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby). The Valerian passage unmistakably presents similarities with Diodorus' account.

Then Valerius introduces a sequence devoted to the construction of the ship, Argo:

> feruere cuncta uirum coetu, simul undique cernit
> delatum nemus et docta resonare bipenni
> litora. iam pinus gracili dissoluere lamna
> Thespiaden iungique latus lentoque sequaces
> molliri uidet igne trabes remisque paratis
> Pallada uelifero quaerentem bracchia malo.
> constitit ut longo moles non peruia ponto,
> puppis et ut tenues subiere latentia cerae
> lumina, picturae uarios super addit honores. (V. Fl. 1.121–129)

> There she sees all astir with the throng of men, and at the same moment the forest felled on every side and the shores ringing with the deft blows of the axe; already Thespian Argus is cleaving pines with the thin saw, and behold, the side is being made, and the planks are being softened into pliancy over a slow flame; the oars are ready, and Pallas is seeking a yard for the sail-bearing mast. When the ship stood firm in its huge bulk, proof against long tracts of sea, and when fine wax had filled the lurking holes, Argus adds paintings of varied grace.

Such a sequence has no parallel in Apollonius, who declares not to treat this topic deliberately.[17] But again Valerius seems to share the source with Diodorus' version of the tale: καὶ πρῶτον μὲν περὶ τὸ Πήλιον ναυπηγήσασθαι σκάφος ... Ἰάσονα δὲ καθελκύσαντα τὸ σκάφος καὶ κοσμήσαντα πᾶσι τοῖς

---

[16] Schwartz (1880) 38.

[17] νῆα μὲν οὖν οἱ πρόσθεν ἔτι κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί / Ἄργον Ἀθηναίης καμέειν ὑποθημοσύνῃσιν ("As for the ship, the songs of former bards still tell how Argus built it according to Athena's instructions," A. R. 1.18–19).

ἀνήκουσι πρὸς ἔκπληξιν λαμπρῶς ("And first of all he built near Mt. Pelion a ship … Jason then launched the ship and fitted it splendidly with everything apt to create amazement," Diod. Sic. 4.41.1–2 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby). By means of the allusion to the pictures decorating the Argo, Valerius recalls the same source of Diodorus, as he is imitating Virgil's description of Juno's temple in Carthage (*Aen.* 1.446–493).

After having recounted Argo's departure, Valerius moves the scene to Olympus where Jupiter, in order to calm down the fears of the Sun, who is concerned for his son Aeetes, explains the true meaning of the expedition in the context of his world plan (V. Fl. 1.498–567). The Flavian poet has clearly developed this episode following the prophecy of Jove in the first book of Virgil's *Aeneid*; I submit, however, that in his sources the idea that the Argonauts' voyage must fit the ordains of a divine plan, had already preexisted. Though never mentioned by Apollonius, such a plan is asserted clearly by Diodorus and probably also by his source Dionysius. In fact, Diodorus explains that the Argonauts anticipate the dangers of the expedition and acknowledge the divine providence behind them: εὐθὺς δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐνδόντος, καὶ δυοῖν ἀστέρων ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν Διοσκόρων κεφαλὰς ἐπιπεσόντων, ἅπαντας μὲν ἐκπλαγῆναι τὸ παράδοξον, ὑπολαβεῖν δὲ θεῶν προνοίᾳ τῶν κινδύνων ἑαυτοὺς ἀπηλλάχθαι ("and immediately when the wind died and two stars fell over the heads of the Dioscuri, everyone was amazed at the incredible thing and realized that they themselves had been rescued from the perils due to divine providence," Diod. Sic. 4.43.2 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby). That Valerius has consulted the same version of the story as Diodorus, is reinforced, in my view, also by another hint. At the end of the passage, Valerius makes Jove hurl a thunderbolt, which breaks into two parts near the ship and reaches the Dioscuri:

> dixit et ingenti flammantem nubile sulco
> direxit per inane facem, quae puppe propinqua
> in bifidum discessit iter fratresque petiuit
> Tyndareos, placida et mediis in frontibus haesit
> protinus amborum lumenque innoxia fudit
> purpureum, miseris olim implorabile nautis. (V. Fl. 1.568–573)

> So he spoke, and through the void aimed a shaft that burned a long furrow in the clouds; and as it neared the ship, it broke in two, sought the two sons of Tyndareus, and forthwith settled with tranquil flame on the midst of their brows and harmlessly shed abroad its bright radiance, to which hapless mariners one day would cry for help.

Albeit in a different context, this prodigy is mentioned by Diodorus in the passage quoted above (δυοῖν ἀστέρων ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν Διοσκόρων κεφαλὰς

ἐπιπεσόντων). Schwartz supports the view that Valerius is inspired by the prodigy in Pindar: ἐκ νεφέων δέ οἱ ἀντάυσε βροντᾶς αἴσιον / φθέγμα· λαμπραὶ δ' ἦλθον ἀκτῖ- / νες στεροπᾶς ἀπορηγνύμεναι ("And from the clouds there answered him an auspicious clap of thunder, and bright flashes of lightning came bursting forth," *Pyth.* 4.196–198).[18] But Valerius adapts this prodigy and makes it a more complex one by combining it with the one in Diodorus (and Dionysius Scytobrachion).

Subsequently Valerius introduces the terrible sea-storm that torments Argonauts as they are setting out (V. Fl. 1.574–656). Such a tempest has no correspondence in Apollonius' Hellenistic poem where a serene beginning of the sailing occurs (A. R. 1.566–568), just as in Pindar (*Pyth.* 4.201–204). Diodorus, however, recounts a sea-storm encountered by the Argonauts after leaving the Troad, and it is assumed that such a scene was also present in Dionysius Scytobrachion too. In my opinion, there is another clue that directs us to see Valerius' awareness of Diodorus' / Dionysius' account in this episode: the Flavian poet insists on the desperation of the Argonauts, who fear for their lives because of the violent storm: *haec iterant segni flentes occumbere leto* ("thus they cried repeatedly, in sorrow that they must die a dullard's death," V. Fl. 1.633). This anxiety can also be found in Diodorus: ἐπιγενομένου δὲ μεγάλου χειμῶνος, καὶ τῶν ἀριστέων ἀπογινωσκόντων τὴν σωτηρίαν ... ("when, however, a great storm fell on them and the champions despaired of salvation ...," Diod. Sic. 43.1.4 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby).

The final part of the first book is devoted by Valerius to the revenge exacted by Pelias against Jason's family for having taken Pelias' son, Acastus, on board; the episode culminates with the suicide of Jason's parents and the murder of Promachus, Jason's little brother. There is no corresponding scene in Apollonius, but, as Schwartz observes,[19] Valerius' section is not very distant from what could have been described by Dionysius Scytobrachion, as it is summarized by Diodorus:

> τῆς δὲ τῶν ἀριστέων ἀνακομιδῆς ἀγνοουμένης ἔτι κατὰ τὴν Θετταλίαν, φασὶ προσπεσεῖν φήμην ὅτι πάντες οἱ μετὰ Ἰάσονος στρατεύσαντες ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὸν Πόντον τόποις ἀπολώλασι. διόπερ τὸν Πελίαν καιρὸν ἔχειν ὑπολαμβάνοντα τοὺς ἐφέδρους τῆς βασιλείας πάντας ἄρδην ἀνελεῖν, τὸν μὲν πατέρα τὸν Ἰάσονος ἀναγκάσαι πιεῖν αἷμα ταύρου, τὸν δ' ἀδελφὸν Πρόμαχον, παῖδα τὴν ἡλικίαν ὄντα, φονεῦσαι. Ἀμφινόμην δὲ τὴν μητέρα μέλλουσαν ἀναιρεῖσθαί φασιν ἔπανδρον καὶ μνήμης ἀξίαν

18 Schwartz (1880) 39.
19 Schwartz (1880) 36.

ἐπιτελέσασθαι πρᾶξιν· καταφυγοῦσαν γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν ἑστίαν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ καταρασαμένην παθεῖν αὐτὸν ἄξια τῶν ἀσεβημάτων, ξίφει πατάξασαν ἑαυτῆς τὸ στῆθος ἡρωικῶς καταστρέψαι τὸν βίον.

(Diod. Sic. 4.50.1–2 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby)

While the return of the champions was still not known in Thessaly, they say that a rumor was spread that all those who had joined Jason in the expedition to the lands at the Pontus had perished. For this reason, Pelias, assuming that the time had come to do away with all who were in line for the throne, forced Jason's father to drink bull's blood, while he killed his brother, Promachus, who was still a boy. But Amphinome, his mother, they say, when she was about to be killed, performed a manly act and one worth remembering: for after she fled to the hearth of the king and cursed him to suffer deeds which were equal to his impieties, striking her own chest with a sword, she died heroically.

2. *Argus Thespiades*

In Valerius, the builder of the Argo is said to come from the Thespian walls, where he resides: the goddess Athena travels to *moenia … / Thespiaca* (V. Fl. 1.92–93) to order Argus to begin construction of the ship.[20] As such, Valerius follows a distinctly different tradition from his model Apollonius, who, in the catalogue of the heroes, declares that Argus, the co-builder with Athena of the ship, comes from Argos and is the son of Arestor: Ἄργος Ἀρεστορίδης (A. R. 1.325). Valerius' modification seems, however, problematic since in the mythographic tradition a few men with the name Argus are known, but no one is called *Thespiades*:[21] Argus, son of Zeus and Niobe, reigned over the Peloponnese, to which he gave his name (a name which was then assigned to the city of Argos);[22] Argus, the monster with one hundred eyes came from Argos;[23] and the city of origin for Argus, the son of Phrixus and Chalciope, daughter of Aeetes, is generally not mentioned.[24] It is plausible that, by affirming the geonymic of Argus as *Thespiades*, Valerius has in mind that the builder of the Argo is one of the *Thespiadae*, i.e., the sons of Heracles

20 The same periphrasis *moenia … Thespia* is used with reference to Argus also at 1.477–478 (quoted below). Furthermore, Argus is called *Thespiades* at 1.124 (quoted above).

21 The issues for such an identification are not well addressed by the various commentators: Burman (1724); Wagner (1805); Lemaire (1824); Kleywegt (2005). Only Langen (1896–1897) 32, Spaltenstein (2002) 62, and Zissos (2008) 135 seem to be aware of this issue. See also Galli (2010) 143–154, for a possible explanation.

22 Cf. Roscher s.v. *Argos* 1.

23 Cf. Roscher s.v. *Argos* 2.

24 Cf. Roscher s.v. *Argos* 3.

by the daughters of Thespius,[25] founder and king of Thespiae in Boeotia. Following Dionysius Scytobrachion, Diodorus is the only other Argonautic source that incorporates some of these obscure sons of Thespius in his list of the Argonauts: *τούτων δ' ὑπάρχειν ἐνδοξοτάτους Κάστορα καὶ Πολυδεύκην, ἔτι δ' Ἡρακλέα καὶ Τελαμῶνα, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Ὀρφέα καὶ τὴν Σχοινέως Ἀταλάντην, ἔτι δὲ τοὺς Θεσπίου παῖδας καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν στελλόμενον τὸν πλοῦν ἐπὶ τὴν Κολχίδα* ("of those, the most famous were Castor and Polydeuces, and furthermore Heracles and Telamon, and also Orpheus and Atalante, and also the sons of Thespius, and the man himself who was outfitting the voyage to Colchis," Diod. Sic. 4.41.2 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby). A few chapters later (Diod. Sic. 4.48.5), Diodorus uses the patronymic Θεσπιάδαι.

In the short overview of the most important Argonauts, immediately after the mention of the Θεσπίου παῖδας, Diodorus's phrase καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν στελλόμενον τὸν πλοῦν ἐπὶ τὴν Κολχίδα proves particularly revealing: in my view, this periphrasis is used by Diodorus with reference to Argus, the builder of the Argo, and not to Jason, as most editors understand it.[26] The expression στέλλειν τὸν πλοῦν means "to set out upon a task" (LSJ s.v. στέλλω), and thus, in my opinion, it is more fitting to describe Argus, the architect of the ship, than Jason, the leader of the Argonauts, especially since the sentence that follows precisely explains the origins of the ship's name: τὴν δὲ ναῦν Ἀργὼ προσαγορευθῆναι κατὰ μέν τινας τῶν μυθογράφων ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸ σκάφος ἀρχιτεκτονήσαντος Ἄργου καὶ συμπλεύσαντος ἕνεκα τοῦ θεραπεύειν ἀεὶ τὰ πονοῦντα μέρη τῆς νεώς ("and the ship was called Argo, according to some of the mythographers, after Argus who was the architect of the vessel and sailed with them so that they could always repair the parts of the ship which were under strain," Diod. Sic. 4.41.3).

In the traditional stories of the fifty nephews of Thespius, no hero named Argus and working as an architect or builder of ships is included.[27] Dionysius Scytobrachion, however, could have probably wrought some changes on the traditional account, as Rusten suggests: "The usual story was that these *Thespiades* were the children of Heracles by the fifty daughters of Thespius and they are nowhere else connected with the Argonauts. Dionysios possi-

---

25 Cf. Roscher s.v. *Thespios*.

26 Müller (1842) 1.218: *Thespii quoque filii, et ipse tandem auctor et dux nauigationis in Colchos*; Constantakopoulou (2010) 51: "and also the sons of Thespios and Jason himself who was outfitting the voyage to Colchis"; and in his Loeb translation, Oldfather (1935) 473: "and the leader himself who was setting out the voyage to Colchis."

27 Apollod. 2.7.8 is the only source of Thespius' offspring. See also Agus (2004) 71–85.

bly told a very different story of their parentage and careers."[28] In my view, it is possible that this builder of the ship is included among the Θεσπίου παῖδας already in Dionysius Scytobrachion' version, and that by calling Argus a *Thespiade*s Valerius is inspired by Dionysius. It is also possible that Dionysius Scytobrachion had consulted ancient Boetian versions of the Argonautic myth, according to which Argus came from Thespiae, just like Tiphys:[29] it has been suggested by Seeliger[30] that Argus' origin from Thespiae must have developed in a very early phase of Argonautic myth, as it was sung in the various Greek cities and turned into a local story, with the participants in the expedition adjusted according to each place. Therefore, a local, Thespian version of the Argonautic voyage would have included Argus and Tiphys.[31] In the same way, Gruppe believes that the tradition of Argus' and Tiphys' provenance from Thespiae points to the emergence and development of the Argonautic myth from Thespiae.[32]

Furthermore, the convergence of Valerius' account with that of Diodorus (and Dionysius) is demonstrated by the very similar representation of Argus' duties. In the catalogue of the Argonauts in the first book of Valerius' poem, Argus is portrayed as follows: *Arge, tuae tibi cura ratis, te moenia doctum / Thespia Palladio dant munere; sors tibi nequa / parte trahat tacitum puppis mare fissaque fluctu / uel pice uel molli conducere uulnera cera* ("To you, Argus, falls the care of your own vessel, with the skill that Pallas has bestowed on you, you are the gift of city of Thespiae; it is your lot to see that the ship on no side let in the stealthy water and to seal the wounds cleft by the waves with pitch or pliant wax," V. Fl. 1.477–480). The description of Argus' responsibilities of Argo's maintenance is very similar to Diodorus' who depicts Argus as the builder who sails with the other Argonauts to Colchis in order to repair the ship, as we saw above (ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸ σκάφος ἀρχιτεκτονήσαντος Ἄργου καὶ συμπλεύσαντος ἕνεκα τοῦ θεραπεύειν ἀεὶ τὰ πονοῦντα μέρη τῆς νεώς). Moreover, the hypothesis of a common source exploited by

---

28 Rusten (1982) 118.

29 On Tiphys, cf. V. Fl. 2.368 and 5.44 (where the poet uses for Tiphys the same adjective, *Thespiades*). Thespiae is Tiphys' city of origin in A. R. 1.105, in the Orphic *Argon*. 122–123.

30 Roscher s.v. *Argonautai und Argonautensage*: "In den Kreis der oben skizzierten thespiensisch-boiotischen Version gehoeren Argo von Thespiai, Tiphys, die Thespiadai."

31 Cf. Roscher s.v. *Argonautai und Argonautensage*: "In Thespiai glaubte man dagegen dass die Argo in der Hafenstadt Tipha oder Sipha von einem Thespienser Argos (Val. Fl. 1, 93, 124, 477) gebaut, von Aphormion abgesegelt und ebendahin zurückgekehrt sei (Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Aformion', Paus. 9, 32, 4); Tiphys, die Thespiaden und andere Boioter galten hier als die Hauptargonauten."

32 Gruppe (1906) 1.549 (s.v. *Argonautensage*).

Diodorus and Valerius can be strengthened by paying attention also to the medical language present in both texts to describe Argus' tasks: the expression (used by Valerius) *conducere uulnera*, a medical metaphor equivalent to the phrase *cicatricem claudere*, corresponds to Diodorus' θεραπεύειν … τὰ πονοῦντα μέρη τῆς νεώς.

3. *Hesione's Rescue*

Valerius does not slavishly follow Apollonius' account in arranging the various books of the Flavian *Argonautica* but rather takes the freedom to eliminate episodes, enlarge or reduce others, and add new ones from other Argonautic sources. The second book of Valerius' poem offers an instructive example: after having narrated the departure of the Argonauts from Lemnos and their arrival at Sigeum, a promontory in the Troad, Valerius narrates the rescue of the daughter of King Laomedon, Hesione, by Hercules (V. Fl. 2.445–578).[33] The episode is not found in Apollonius, nor is it mentioned by Pindar. Scholars have long noticed that the only other author telling the story of Hesione is Diodorus himself (Diod. Sic. 4.42 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby).[34]

In his commentary, H.M. Poortvliet points out: "Diodorus seems to have suggested to Valerius the very idea of including the Hesione episode in his *Argonautica*."[35] But it is probable that Valerius' account of Hesione goes back to Dionysius Scytobrachion's *Argonautica*. In his study on Dionysius, Rusten points out that the rescue of Hesione, as part of the Argonauts' story, was one of the innovations introduced by Dionysius in his treatment of the Argonaut myth:[36] in fact, before Dionysius, the myth had no connection with the voyage of the Argo; the Greek mythographer included the rescue of Hesione among the various adventures on the way to Colchis in order to emphasize Hercules' role as a leader of the Argonauts.

In my opinion, various details demonstrate that Valerius' source for this episode is not Diodorus but Dionysius Scytobrachion instead. First of all, in the beginning of the episode, Valerius recounts that Hercules and Telamon take a stroll on the shore and hear a lament before they see a girl in fet-

---

[33] *RE* 8.1: 1240–1242; Roscher s.v. *Hesione*. This story is also reported by Hyginus (*Fab.* 89).

[34] See, e.g., Stender (1874) 30: *praeter hosce duos historia illa non inuenitur tali modo exhibita*. See also Mitousi in this volume, pp. 164–165.

[35] Poortvliet (1991) 240.

[36] Rusten (1982) 41.

ters: *Alcides Telamonque comes dum litora blando / anfractu sinuosa legunt, uox accidit aures / flebile succedens cum fracta remurmurat unda* ("while Hercules with Telamon at his side passed along the shore that broke back in a pleasant inlet, a voice fell upon their ears, sounding mournfully as each wave broke and murmured away again," V. Fl. 2.451–464). By contrast, Diodorus begins the episode of the rescue of Hesione at the point when all the Argonauts land on the shore of Sigeum and come across Hesione's predicament (ἐνταῦθα δ' αὐτῶν τὴν ἀπόβασιν ποιησαμένων, εὑρεθῆναί φασι παρθένον δεδεμένην παρὰ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν, "there, when they disembarked, it is said they found a virgin in chains by the seashore," Diod. Sic. 4.42.1); in addition, Diodorus focuses on Hercules alone, making no mention of Telamon (τὸν μὲν Ἡρακλέα μετὰ τῶν Ἀργοναυτῶν τὴν ἀπόβασιν ποιησάμενον, "with Heracles disembarking with the Argonauts," Diod. Sic. 4.42.5), as Valerius does. But a papyrus fragment (*P. Mich. Inv.* 1316 v) reveals Dionysius Scytobrachion's account of the rescue,[37] grouping Heracles and Telamon together: ["Ἴλιον αὐτοὺς ἀγαγὼν ἀκολου- / θ-]. Διονυσίωι Ἡσιόνην τὴν Λαο- / μέδοντος] ... εκκειμένην τῶι κήτει ἰδὼν /].. αυτης σὺν Τελαμῶνι βουλευ-/ ("leading them against Ilion according (?) to Dionysius, when he saw Hesione, the daughter of Laomedon, who was exposed to the monster, her, with Telamon, he wished to ..." *P. Mich. Inv.* 1316 v lines 5–8 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 15 Jacoby). Rusten explains that the fragment makes a clear reference to the *Argonautica* of Dionysius Scytobrachion, as we can glean from the name Dionysius.[38]

Furthermore, when Hercules asks Hesione about the reasons for her predicament, Valerius uses the expression *ductor ait* in order to introduce the questions asked by Heracles to the girl: *ductor ait: 'quod, uirgo, tibi nomenque genusque, / quae sors ista, doce, tendunt cur uincula palmas?* ("The hero spoke: 'Maiden, what is your name and your family? What is this lot of yours? Tell me why chains strain your hands?' " V. Fl. 2.468–469). This use of *ductor* with reference to Hercules is curious, since in Valerius' poem it is Jason who is the leader of the Argonauts, not Hercules (V. Fl. 1.164, 184,

---

37 Rusten (1982) 53 believes that this fragment belongs to a commentary on an Argonaut story or to a treatise on literary criticism; Rusten (1982) 54: "Lines 5–8 of the papyrus, although they cannot be supplemented with any certainty, are nonetheless recognizable as an account of the rescue of Hesione by Heracles and Telamon within the context of the Argonauts' expedition. We have already seen that the earliest known account of the Argonauts to include Hesione's rescue was that of Dionysius; and just as the second part of that story is cited from Dionysius in *P. Oxy.* 2812 lines 6–12, so a reference to the rescue itself (cf. Diod. 4.42 ~ F 16) is given here under Dionysius' name in lines 5–8." For the publication and discussion of the papyrus, see Rusten (1982) 53–64 and Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1981) 339A.

38 Rusten (1982) 61–62.

240). The commentator, Poortvliet, does not comment on the peculiarity,[39] but the *OLD* (s.v. *ductor*) clearly specifies that *ductor* is applied to the leader of an expedition or something similar. We know, however, that one of the major innovations of Dionysius Scytobrachion's *Argonautica* is the placing of Heracles as the leader of the trip to Colchis.[40] Valerius seems to have used the same expression as his source, without adapting it to the different context of his poem.

Even though Valerius' account is obviously more detailed than Diodorus', the narrative structure of the episode is the same in both authors. The Argonauts land on the shore, they soon realize someone's distress, and they follow the voice until they discover chained Hesione. Hercules interrogates the girl, and Hesione gives all necessary information about the plague, the sea-monster, and the oracle by Apollo ordering her father, Laomedon, to sacrifice one of his children. While in Diodorus Hesione's situation is explained before the brief dialogue between the princess and Heracles (Diod. Sic. 4.42.2–5), Valerius follows a more logical order, choosing to let the girl directly explain her predicament to the hero (V. Fl. 2.470–492).

In addition, there is another element that suggests that Diodorus and Valerius are using the same source. First, Hesione's description of her present condition as a reversal of fortune is a common feature in the two accounts: Diodorus uses the Greek word περιπέτεια ("reversal of fortune," Diod. 4.42.5); Valerius insists on a similar concept, letting Hesione herself explain the tragic upheaval in her life (*nos Ili felix quondam genus, inuida donec / Laomedonteos fugeret Fortuna penates*, "our stock sprang of Ilus, happy once until envious Fortune deserted the home of Laomedon," V. Fl. 2.473–474). Second, Valerius and Diodorus mention the shepherds and the farmers flee because they fear the sea-monster; the detail is more articulated in Diodorus' account and is reduced to a hint in Valerius'. The Flavian poet just explains that, after the death of the sea-monster, the shepherds quickly return to the pasture lands across the seashore (*protinus e scopulis et opaca ualle resurgunt / pastores magnisque petunt clamoribus urbem. / nuntius hinc socios Telamon uocat ac simul ipsi / horrescunt subitoque uident in sanguine puppem*, "Straightway the shepherds rise up from the crags and

[39] Poortvliet (1991) 254.

[40] Rusten (1982) 96–97 points out that in his *Argonautica* Dionysius Scytobrachion makes Heracles the leader of the expedition in order to exploit the conceptual association of the hero spreading Greek civilization to the barbaric lands. Constantakopoulou (2010) suggests that "the adding of Heracles in such a prominent role in the story could also be explained as an attempt to provide a different and innovative narrative."

out of the shade of the valley and with loud shouts make towards the city. Thereupon Telamon brought the tidings and called his comrades, while themselves they shudder to see the ship in a sudden tide of blood," V. Fl. 2.538–541). Diodorus provides ample details and offers a more complete explanation which helps us understand the reference in Valerius' account: at 4.42.2, the historian explains that those who made their living by the seashore and those who farmed the land close to the sea, had abandoned the lands because of the arrival of the monster. Finally, as the conclusion to the episode, Heracles' promise to come back and take gifts offered by Laomedon for having defeated the monster is used by Valerius (*mox huc uestras reuehemur ad oras / donaque dicta feram*, "soon shall we return hither to your shores, and I will take the gift you have promised," V. Fl. 2.575–576) and Diodorus (τὸν δ' Ἡρακλέα δώροις καὶ τοῖς προσήκουσι ξενίοις λαμπρῶς τιμηθέντα τὴν Ἡσιόνην καὶ τὰς ἵππους παραθέσθαι τῷ Λαομέδοντι, συνταξάμενον μετὰ τὴν ἐκ Κόλχων ἐπάνοδον ἀπολήψεσθαι, αὐτὸν δ' ἀναχθῆναι μετὰ τῶν Ἀργοναυτῶν κατὰ σπουδὴν ἐπὶ τὸν προκείμενον ἆθλον, "and after he was honored splendidly with gifts and the appropriate tokens of hospitality, Heracles left Hesione and the horses with Laomedon, having arranged to receive them again after he came back from Colchis," Diod. Sic. 4.42.7 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby).

4. *Conclusion*

Valerius' use of Dionysius Scytobrachion' s *Argonautica* remains controversial. Schwartz considers it more likely that Valerius draws on the Scholia to Apollonius rather than directly on Dionysius' work: in his opinion, the Scholia would have normally comprised a wider commentary combined with extensive references to the works of other authors. The number of references to Dionysius by Valerius, especially in the first book of his poem, lets us presume that Valerius actually knew sections of that work, not only isolated details. But still, we are not so well informed about the circulation of Dionysius Scytobrachion's *Argonautica* in Rome in order to understand how Valerius may have known this version of the *Argonautica*.

VALERIUS' *ARGONAUTICA* AS AN IDEOLOGICAL EPIC OF THE FLAVIAN ERA[*]

Irene Mitousi

1. *The Ideological Dimension in Valerius*

Despite the reluctance of earlier criticism on Valerius' *Argonautica* to recognize any ideological dimension in the poem, Ruth Taylor's study initiated a renewed interest in the ideological character of the epic.[1] Her approach focuses on a network of symbolisms and typologies read as mere reflections of the contemporary Flavian reality. Flavian epicists, according to Taylor,[2] assume, in their imitation of Virgil, the *symbolic* connection between historical reality and epic, as well the *typological* connection between its mythological characters and certain historical and contemporary figures.

Symbolism and typology, however, seem to be the outer symptoms of some inner, textual processes concerning both structural and actantial matters. Moreover, Taylor's attempt for certain identifications (i.e., Hercules = Augustus, Jason = Vespasian) is not always consistent[3] with the text since external prolepses foretell Jason's failure to ensure the continuity of his *gens*, and, as a result, of his dynasty, a fact that differentiates and distances him from Vespasian and his offspring, as they are portrayed in the proem. In addition, the association of Hercules to Augustus seems rather difficult since Antony himself had claimed the demigod as his own ancestor.[4]

In place of symbolisms, therefore, a concrete definition of "ideological" would be more appropriate. In *Authoritarian fictions*, Susan Suleiman

* For their thorough reading of the present paper and their valuable suggestions which have improved both the argument and the presentation of my paper, I thank V. Fyntikoglou and A. Augoustakis. S. Kyriakides, E. Kyriakidou, and C. Chelidoni-Tsitsiou have also been morally and practically supportive to my endeavor.

1 See, e.g., Garson (1965) and Strand (1972).

2 Taylor (1994) 217–218. On the political nature of the suicide of Jason's parents in book 1, see, e.g., Manuwald (2000) 338 n. 37.

3 See also Conte (1994) 405, who observes that the link between Jason and Vespasian is not consistently sustained through the course of the poem.

4 Edwards (1999) 152 and n. 6, 158.

proposes the following definition: “A roman à thèse [an epic à thèse, in our case] is a work written in the realistic mode (that is, based on an aesthetic of verisimilitude and representation), which signals itself to the reader as primarily didactic in intent, seeking to demonstrate the validity of a political, philosophical or religious doctrine.”[5] In other words the narrated story entails its own specific meaning and interpretation to which the reader is led by the narrative hypersystem of the text. The omniscient narrator dictates not only the story but its interpretation too, its meaning and the way to be read, the narrator “functions not only as ‘author’ but also as *authority*.”[6]

In searching for the intended meaning of Valerius’ poem, the epic’s proem is instructive:[7] deviating sensibly from Apollonius (A. R. 1.1–4), Valerius omits any mention of the Golden Fleece and presents as main purpose of the voyage the expansion of navigational frontiers,[8] thus emphasizing the innovative role of the Argo, the first ship ever to sail (V. Fl. 1.1). Moreover, the dedication to Vespasian that follows the proem presents the emperor too as conqueror of the sea (1.7–8) who has surpassed his predecessors, the Julio-Claudians (1.8–9). It becomes obvious that Argo’s voyage as a parallel to Vespasian’s conquests denotes the analogy between the Argonautic expedition and Vespasian’s enterprise.

The alignment is further reinforced through the catasterism of the ship: the Argo will be transferred to the sky (1.4), as Darcy Krasne and Carey Seal have discussed in this volume, a fate to which Tiphys hints in the second book describing Argo’s course in accordance to the constellation of the Serpent that never sets (*sed mihi dux, uetitis qui numquam conditus undis / axe nitet, Serpens, septenosque implicat ignes*, “but my guide will be he that never hides beneath the forbidden waters as he shines about the pole, the Serpent that enfolds the seven stars,” 2.64–65);[9] at the same time, the reader

---

[5] Suleiman (1983) 7.

[6] Suleiman (1983) 72.

[7] Taylor (1994) 216 underlines the significance of the first four lines of the epic that “offer us an authoritative and unique insight into the way in which the poet himself viewed its subject-matter.”

[8] Cf. Feeney’s (1991) 331 comment that “the emphasis on the Argo as the world’s first ship is something of overpowering importance, crowding out even mention of the golden fleece from the proem.” See also extensively Seal in this volume, pp. 113–135; however, the *ratis* in Hypsipyle’s story (2.285) may refer to any floating object, from a raft to a ship (*OLD* s.v. *ratis*) as it is implied by Apollonius’ (λάρνακι δ’ ἐν κοίλῃ, “a hollow chest”, A. R. 1.622) or Statius’ account (*curuo robore*, “in curved timber,” *Theb*. 5.287). On the proem, see Stover (2012) 14–25.

[9] See Hardie (1993) 84.

remembers Valerius' pronouncement that the deified Vespasian will shine all over the world (1.15–18).

By means of intratextuality, therefore, the Argo and its innovative enterprise is aligned with Vespasian himself while the literary device of *recusatio* extends the parallelism to his dynastic enterprise; in justifying the choice of a mythological subject for his poem rather than a historical one (1.11–12), Valerius manages to praise subtly all three members of the Flavian *gens* (1.12–14):[10] "Titus' military deeds are too great to be praised by Valerius, because only a relative of future gods, like Domitian, is up to that task."[11] The Argo no longer represents a demoralizing agent leading humanity from the Golden to the Iron Age; by contrast, as a civilizing factor it becomes a symbol of how Jupiter and the Flavian emperors will make the former materialize during the latter.[12] Valerius not only achieves to valorize positively the navigation theme, a *sine qua non* for the didactic purposes of his ideological treatment, but he also instructs his ideal reader to consider Argo's innovative trip as Vespasian's dynastic enterprise, substituting the one for the other.[13]

Hence the intended meaning of the epic, as it is clearly stated in the proem, is that the innovative voyage of the Argo stands for the Flavian dynastic enterprise. Valerius may openly reject the historical epic as a subject-matter, but he subtly invites his reader to read the epic of the Flavian dynasty between the lines of his mythological epic. On an intratextual level, the interchangeability between the voyage of the Argo and Vespasian's reign allows the interweavement of the mythical past with the contemporary (Flavian) present. On an intertextual level, the Flavian era as described in the proem bears echoes of the Augustan era, inasmuch as the proem of the *Argonautica* (V. Fl. 1–21) follows closely the tripartite structure of Virgil's *Georgics* (1.1–42),[14] while the appeal to Vespasian and his benevolence towards the

---

10 It is indicative that the Senate honors not only Vespasian but Titus and Domitian too (Tac. *Hist.* 4.3). It is noteworthy that Titus' office is unparalleled, and it is possibly invented with the intention to honor all three Flavians equally. For the simultaneous praising of all three Flavians, see Galli (2013) 59–60.

11 On the *recusatio-excusatio*, see most recently Galli (2013) 55–60.

12 See Stover (2012) 27–77.

13 Concerning the two *consecrationes*, Ehlers (1971–1972) 115 adds his suspicion that "das Epos nicht nur die Argo zum Thema hat, sondern auch die Legitimierung des flavischen Hauses durch eine Leistung, durch die sie den götterentsprossenen Juliern überlegen ist." Cf. Hardie's (1993) 83 comment that "it would be perverse to dismiss this association of the mythical and historical as no more than a flourish of flattery."

14 Thematic declaration (*canimus*), appelation of the inspiring deity (*Phoebe*), and invocation of the emperor (*tuque*); see Zissos (2008) 71. Valerius' indebtedness to Virgil's *Georgics*

poem (V. Fl. 1.7 and 20–21), as well the mention of his future deification and catasterism (1.16–17), recall Virgil's appeal to Octavian (*G.* 1. 24–42, esp. 25 and 32), who is also expected to be deified and shine as a star.

Yet, by what means does Valerius try to impose his intended meaning? Among the rhetorical techniques employed to impose a "single reading," redundancy holds a prominent place.[15] For Roland Barthes, redundant discourse is a discourse where "meaning is excessively named."[16] In linguistics and information theory, redundancy is defined as a "surplus of communication," that aims at a maximal reduction of ambiguity by eliminating the interference of "noise." Considered as a means of disambiguation, redundancy ensures the correct reception of the meaning, that the meaning should be understood without ambiguity. In addition, the rhetoric of an ideological work consists in multiplying redundancies on every level (characters and their functions, narrative sequences, descriptions) in order to reduce the "openings" that might make a plural reading possible.

Corroborative redundancy, however, should not be confused with mere repetition of the "same" event, retold in a way that contradicts previous versions,[17] as, for example, in the *roman nouveau* where the same event may be narrated several times with different focalization, or even contradictory to each other focalizations, or in Ovid's *Heroides*, where repeatedness is the outer symptom of the narrator's intention to provide a catalogue. Suleiman discerns three types of redundancies, on the level of the story, on the level of discourse, and between the level of story and the level of discourse.[18]

The present paper will focus on the more obvious redundancies on the level of the story, closely related to structural and actantial elements of the plot. Several of the redundancies on the level of the story, as discussed by Suleiman, can be applied to Valerius' poem: a/ the same event or same sequence of events happens to more than one characters (well-known form of narrative doubling or tripling); b/ the same event or same sequence of

---

is not only confined to the usage of the encomium as a model for his *laudatio principis*; the approach he takes to the seafaring theme seems also to reflect the perspective of Virgil's didactic poem. In the beginning of the first book of the *Georgics*, sailing and navigation are included among the non-agricultural *artes* of the modern age of Jupiter (*G.* 1. 129–138), the advent of which heralds the end of the idyllic Golden Age. Similarly the Argo is scheduled to be part of the transition from the Age of Saturn to that of Jupiter, contributing to the establishment of a new order.

15 Suleiman (1983) 54–56.

16 Suleiman (1983) 55 n. 32.

17 Suleiman (1983) 168.

18 Suleiman (1983) 159–170.

events happens to a single character *n* times (another type of narrative reduplication); and c/ several characters have the same qualities or accomplish the same qualifying functions. In a literary text, however, all the above mentioned redundancies are hardly separable but rather closely interwoven.

2. *Type A Redundancy*

a. *The Tyranny Theme*

Dissimulating tyrants becomes a recurrent theme throughout the epic. First of all, Jason finds himself at the mercy of Pelias (V. Fl. 1.23), who is preoccupied with the hero's extermination. The striking absence of the Jason-Pelias dialogue in Apollonius is indicative of Valerius' intention to underscore the tyrant's guile, which is only implied in other Argonautic accounts.[19] Valerius elaborates on Pelias' character by inserting an indirect speech (1.25–39), revelatory about Pelias' inner thoughts, sentiments and malign plans.[20]

In his treatment of the encounter between Jason and Pelias, Valerius exploits both Pindar's and Apollonius' accounts, highlighting different elements from each. Thus, extending Apollonius' brief allusions, the Flavian poet makes Pelias himself devise the mission without any challenge, from Jason's part, for the throne. Valerius omits Dionysius Scytobrachion's realistic explanation that Jason wishes "to accomplish a deed worthy of memory" (ἐπιθυμῆσαί τι πρᾶξαι μνήμης ἄξιον, Diod. Sic. 4.40.1 ~ Dionysius Scytobrachion F 14 Jacoby) in imitation of Perseus' exploits,[21] and fashions Pelias as the ruthless tyrant who pronounces a *de facto* command (V. Fl. 1.58–59). Pelias' *dolus* is immediately sensed (1.64) and later confirmed by Jason himself during his libation to Poseidon (1.200–201).

Moreover, Pelias' speech in Valerius (1.40–57), closely modeled upon Pindar's fourth *Pythian* (4.156–167), invokes a dream visitation by the shade of Phrixus as the formal pretext for the whole expedition. Phrixus is said to having been brutally murdered by Aeetes and pleading for retaliation through the repartition of the Golden Fleece (V. Fl. 1.41–46), a fate openly contradicted later (5.224–225) when Phrixus appears to have died of old

---

19 Pind. *Pyth.* 4.96–97; A. R. 1.15–17 and 3.333–339; cf. Dionysius Scytobrachion and Galli's discussion in this volume, pp. 137–151.

20 For Valerius' particular interest in the psychology of his protagonists, see Zissos (2008) xxxiii–xxxiv.

21 See Galli in this volume, pp. 141–142.

age, as in Apollonius' account (A. R. 2.1140–1151).[22] The selective breeding of the Greek authors' accounts by Valerius results in bringing forward Pelias' dissimulation,[23] a stock characteristic of tyrannical behavior in the epic.

The portraiture of Pelias as a tyrant, however, is completed with the deliberate concealment of the sea perils from Jason (V. Fl. 1.59–63). As a continuation of Pelias' direct speech to Jason, his inner thoughts conveyed through his own focalization reveal the real incentive. At first, Pelias as "a latter-day Eurystheus"[24] schemes Jason's extermination through the assignment of impossible labors but, unable to find any available *monstra* or *bella* (1.33–36), he resorts to the perils of sea (1.37). As in the case of Pelias' guile, Jason himself will later make explicit the Pelias-Eurystheus analogy (5.486–488). The equation of Pelias with Eurystheus indirectly introduces the Jason-Hercules analogy and, thus, prefigures not only the encounter of Jason with Aeetes in the seventh book (*alium hic Pelian ... cerno!* "here I see another Pelias!" 7.92), as it has often been suggested,[25] but also and mostly the Hercules-Laomedon encounter of the second book.

Valerius, then, invites his reader to read the Laomedon-Hercules episode at the end of the second book (2.550–578) as an immediate reduplication of the preceding Pelias-Jason scene in the first book. The encounter between Laomedon and Hercules is absent from Apollonius, but is incorporated in the Argonautic saga by Diodorus Siculus (4.42, 4.49.3–7), as Daniela Galli discusses in her essay. The adoption of the episode by Valerius, however, shows a crucial deviation from Diodorus. While the Greek author, possibly like Scytobrachion before him, simply presents the encounter without any further comment (Diod. Sic. 4.42) and sets the Laomedon's guile in a second episode, at Heracles' return from Colchis (Diod. Sic. 4.49.3–7), Valerius integrates Laomedon's dishonest intentions already in his first encounter with Hercules, thus fashioning the Trojan king as another ruthless tyrant of the Golden Age.

The impact of this certain condensation proves to be critical as far as it concerns Laomedon's characterization. Although Hesione has hidden from Heracles her father's former fraud against Neptune and Apollo (V. Fl. 2.473–492), Valerius' pointed description of the king of Troy brings out an

---

22 See Seal in this volume, pp. 124–125.

23 For dissimulation in the epic world, see Hershkowitz (1998) 242–267; for dissimulation in the encounter with Pelias, see MacGuire (1997) 157–159.

24 Zissos (2008) 101–102.

25 Adamietz (1976) 7–8, Zissos (2008) 107–108.

even more dangerous tyrant than Pelias who manages to conceal his fear and hatred (*tranquilla ... fronte*, 1.38–39): Laomedon incarnates terror itself, his dreadful look (2.555) betrays danger and guile (2.555). His real thoughts, sentiments and plotting against the hero are highlighted, again, as formerly in the case of Pelias, through a free indirect speech that strongly contradicts his direct speech to Heracles (2.557–566): *iam maestus equos, iam debita posci / dona gemit ... tacitosque dolos dirumque uolutat / corde nefas*, "sadly he laments that his horses, the due reward, are now claimed ... silently in his heart he ponders treachery and a hateful crime," (2.552–553 and 567–568).

By integrating Laomedon's *dolus* into the scene, Valerius manages to exhibit the discrepancy between Laomedon's uttered speech and his intentions revealing him as an *infidus tyrannus* (2.577), a characteristic that also functions as pre-announcement of another tyrant, Aeetes (5.222–223). The Hesione episode, then, is meant to be read not only as a corroborated reduplication of the Pelias-Jason encounter, but also as an anticipation of the Jason-Aeetes' episode in the second half of the poem.[26] There the theme of tyranny culminates through the blending of the first two types of redundancy: the same event not only happens to more than one characters, but also the same event happens to a single character *n* times.

Valerius takes great pains to prepare Aeetes' entrance by presenting his genealogy through an ekphrasis at the temple of Sol (5.408–454) and, instead of the single audition in Apollonius, the Flavian poet creates a second one in the seventh book (7.32–102). As an epitome of tyranny, Aeetes' case encapsulates all the cruel and cunning behavior of the precedent tyrants: he looks threatening (*uultu ... minaci*, 5.519) and rages from anger inside. Again, the free indirect speech (5.519–533), reflecting his real thoughts and sentiments stands in total contrast to his direct speech (5.534–541), revealing his unparalleled skill at dissimulation (*fingit placidis fera pectora dictis*, "he shapes the fierceness of his heart into peaceful words," 5.533), further stressed by the arrangement abAB (*placidis fera pectora dictis*): the quasi-silver line betrays Aeetes' real sentiments.[27]

As reincarnation of Laomedon, Aeetes appears openly reluctant to fulfill his promise to Jason: Laomedon's reluctance to give the promised reward to Hercules (2.552 and 576) is reflected on Jason's expectation to carry the

[26] See, especially, Fucecchi (1996) 119, who recognizes in Laomedon's behavior un *trait d'union* between Pelias and Aeetes. Cf. Adamietz (1976) 40 and Hershkowitz (1998) 247 n. 14.

[27] Zissos (2008) 107: "... what the tyrant typically masks with a cheerful or tranquil expression is murderous intent, driven by hatred and fear."

Golden Fleece (6.548 and 593), foretelling the future denial. In addition, as an extension of Pelias, Aeetes resorts twice to the same ruse: he does not openly reject Jason's demand but asks first for his aid in the civil war with Perses (5.534–541), and later, as a latter-day Eurystheus and Pelias, assigns him some impossible labors to eliminate him (7.61–77).

Therefore, Aeetes concentrates all types and variants of tyrants (Eurystheus-Pelias-Laomedon). As we have seen, the redundancy of the first type suggests emphatically the dominance of tyrants in the Golden Age, to which the Argonautic expedition would bring an end. Similarly, through the intended meaning of the epic, Vespasian and his dynasty is meant to terminate the reign of several tyrants.

In the specific obsession with tyranny, several scholars justifiably recognized "a covert way of raising thoughts about the imperial system,"[28] while others go even further to point to the rule of Domitian, thus implying a critical attitude to the emperor.[29] It would be more reasonable to read this obsession against tyrants as a part of Vespasian's anti-Neronian propaganda,[30] aiming tacitly not only at Nero himself, but also at Otho and Vitellius, who appear as the spiritual heirs of Nero[31] and, in the eyes of Vespasian represent an oriental type of tyranny (Tac. *Ann.* 3.55). In addition, Vespasian, though a usurper himself, achieves to appear in the so-called *Lex de imperio Vespasiani* of 69 CE, which confers constitutional powers and privileges on to the emperor, as the lawful successor to the deified Augustus, Tiberius, and Claudius while the names of Gaius, Nero, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius are omitted.[32]

b. *The* Monstrum *Theme*

On account of redundancy, Golden Age is no longer the idyllic period of humanity, as it is nostalgically praised by the Augustan poets. And its peacefulness is further denigrated through redundancy of the *monstrum* theme. People of the Golden Age suffer not only because of their kings' malicious arbitrariness but also because of monsters and other physical θαυμάσια, like the Symplegades. Again, the first type redundancy proves to be very effec-

---

28 Murgatroyd (2009) 75–77; cf. McGuire (1997) 44–45, 147–148.

29 Hershkowitz (1998) 247.

30 Charlesworth (1937) 55 and Ferill (1965) 269, who resumes largely Charlesworth's positions.

31 Suet. *Otho* 7.1 and *Vit.* 11.2.

32 McCrum and Woodhead (1961) 1–2.

tive, since narrative duplication renders even more forcible the intended meaning of the epic. It is worth noting that almost all "monster" stories are gathered at the end of the first half of the epic, before the final conflict with Aeetes. The fourth book ends with a *Ringkomposition*[33] since its final section recalls the opening one with a son of Jupiter featuring in each of them (Hercules, Pollux), so that the Argonauts' role as executors of Jupiter's command and order on earth might be stressed.

The story of Amycus (4.99–343), who may also be viewed as one of the several tyrants in the *Argonautica*,[34] has already been announced in Mopsus' prophecy (1.220) and in his comparison to Cyzicus (2.647–648).[35] Despite his human appearance, Amycus looks like a monstrous hybrid, reminiscent of Homer's and Ovid's Polyphemus, Virgil's Cacus, Mezentius, and Turnus.[36] Deviating from Apollonius (A. R. 2.1–163), Valerius creates a terrifying monster of enormous size and strength, with no respect either to divine or human law (4.102–103 and 109).

But Valerius does not confine himself to depicting just another version of the Cyclops but transforms Amycus' contempt of laws into open hostility towards Jupiter (4.219): his speech (4.206–221) is an explicit derision of the law of hospitality in identifying *lex* (210), *hospitia* (213), *foedera* (215) with his boxing glove, the *caestus*. Amycus is officially declared as Jupiter's enemy through his comparison to the Giant Typhoeus (4.236); Amycus' open hostility to Jupiter is absent from Apollonius, and Valerius portrays him as a reborn Giant, and consequently the fight between Amycus and Pollux as a new Gigantomachy.[37] A reference to the Gigantomachy, as the Argonauts pass by Pallene (2.17–33), prefigures the future fight between the monster and the son of Leda.

In this Gigantomachy, Pollux, *sanguis Iouis* ("the offspring of Jove,"[38] 4.256), ensures the re-establishment of Jupiter's cosmic order[39] while the Argonauts realize Jupiter's command (1.563–567). Amycus' punishment

---

33 Murgatroyd (2009) 2.

34 Cf. Murgatroyd's (2009) 75–77.

35 See also Adamietz (1976) 54 and Murgatroyd (2009) 75–77.

36 Hershkowitz (1998) 81 and n. 177; cf. Adamietz (1976) 57–58 n. 61 and Murgatroyd (2009) 77.

37 Adamietz (1976) 57. Gigantomachic motifs are employed in general (as in the case of Boreas and Aeolus, and the civil war in Cyzicus and Colchis) by Valerius in order to vilify the enemies of the Jovian regime and to present the Argonauts as pious agents of Jupiter's reunification program; see Stover (2012) 81–84, 126–150.

38 For the wordplay on the hero's identity, see also Finkmann in this volume, pp. 86–87.

39 Korn (1989) 84–85.

leads to the restitution of the cosmic order: Tartarus sends the souls of Amycus' victims to view the spectacle (4.258–260); as agents of Jupiter[40] and Fate, the Argonauts not only take revenge from the impious ones but also terminate the punishment of people long enough tormented for their crimes. The first punishment which the Argonauts are destined to bring to end, acting as agents of Fate, is the isolation of the Lemnian women[41] (2.323–325). On their way to Colchis, the Argonauts continue this trend. For instance, Phineus, the blind, helpless king, suffers from the rapacious Harpies (4.423–528), a punishment from Jupiter (4.528, 474). In the sons of Boreas, Phineus recognizes his saviors (4.461), who are assigned this very task by Fate (4.431–432). In his case, *fata* are proved to be the cause of both his doom and salvation: in his second speech (4.474–484), Phineus narrates the crime he had committed against Jupiter (4.479–481), similar to the one perpetrated by Prometheus (4.66–67). He has betrayed Jupiter's *fata*, and it will be exactly this *fata* that should assent to his redemption (4.485).[42]

Amycus and the Harpies are officially registered in the poem as *monstra* (4.155, 188, 456, 462), while we may conjecture its monstrous nature of the Clashing Rocks from their vivid personification: "the (personified) Symplegades (637–710) recall Amycus, as they are also violent and insane Hinderers who are finally overcome";[43] the insane rocks (4.641) meet together (4.657), send back to the sea their broken cliffs (4.658), lower over the Argonauts (4.680–681). As in the case of Amycus, Valerius gives great prominence to the crossing of Symplegades, creating an event of cosmic importance.

In Apollonius, there are only two brief mentions to the crossing of the Clashing Rocks, in the proem (A. R. 1.2–4) and in Phineus' prophecy to the Argonauts (2.317–340). On the contrary, in the Flavian epic, the theme becomes more elaborate, in a separate scene (V. Fl. 4.637–710), having foreshadowed on many an occasion,[44] namely in the proem (1.3), in Pelias' murderous intentions (1.59–60), in the seastorm (1.630), in Hercules' complaint (2.381–382), in the Hylas episode (3.621), and finally in Amycus' boast of his isolated place (4.221).

The passing through Symplegades, the ultimate labor to be accomplished before the arrival at Colchis officially signals the transition to heretofore

40 See also Finkmann in this volume, p. 86.
41 Adamietz (1976) 59.
42 For this role of *fata*, see esp. Adamietz (1976) 59.
43 Murgatroyd (2009) 3.
44 See more instances in Adamietz (1976) 61 and 62.

unexplored parts of the world, the advent of a new era. Although they acknowledge divine aid (4.704–705), Jason and his comrades appear ignorant of the future impact of their accomplishment (4.707). The omniscient narrator, however, hastens to make clear that the traversing of the Rocks actually means that they are forever bound by *imperio … Iouis* ("Jove's command," 4.708) and *fati certa … lege* ("Fate's unalterable law," 4.709).

For the third time, as in the case of Amycus and Harpies before, the Argonauts manifest themselves as agents of Jupiter's *fata* and contributors to the advent of the new order and era. Thus far the first-type redundancy has revealed a world abundant not only in tyrants but in monsters also—Amycus, the Harpies and the Clashing Rocks are related to other monsters in the epic (Hesione's sea-beast, Aeetes' fire-breathing bulls, the earthborn men and the guardian of the Golden Fleece); at the same time, the duplication of the motif has brought to the surface the importance of the redemptory and civilizing role of the Argonauts, as reflected upon Vespasian and his dynasty.

The redundancy of the monster theme aims at sanctioning not only the Argonautic expedition but the Flavian enterprise too, presenting both as restorers of order and agents of a new era. Even the civil war undertaken later by the Argonauts on Aeetes' side may be seen as a positive contribution[45] to the establishment of Jupiter's rule. Furthermore, as Tim Stover has convincingly argued, the return of heroic *labor* under Jupiter's reign can be viewed as a comparandum for the end of the civil war and the return of imperial expansion under Vespasian.[46]

Surprisingly, the last *monstrum* to be confronted is Medea herself (*quanti thalamos ascendere monstri / arserit*, "how dire a monster she was for whose marriage couch he yearned," 6.45–46). Several prolepses to be fulfilled in extradiegetic time,[47] and, therefore, redundancies on the level of discourse only, inform the reader about Medea's monstrous nature. Mopsus' prophecies in the first and eighth book (1.224–226, 8.248–251), Anausis in the sixth book (6.45–46), and the ekphrasis in the temple of the Sun (5.452–454)

45 See Stover (2012) 113, 114 where he recognizes the *bellum ciuile* theme as an "important *Leitmotiv*" throughout the epic, and as a catalyst for positive historical change. Civil war and fratricide, for example, may be read as a redemptive reaction to the tyrant's malignity who disregards his own people's prosperity for his personal interest (*nec uulgi cura tyranno dum sua sit modo tuta salus*, "the tyrant does not care about his folk, so long as his own safety is assured," 5.264–265). See also extensively Seal in this volume, pp. 113–135.

46 Stover (2012) 27–77 and esp. 48.

47 Hershkowitz (1998) 17–22.

foreshadow the infanticide and the poisoning of the Corinthian bride. As a *barbara* (8.251), Medea evidently does not fit the civilized pattern and thus represents the savage, old order of affairs.

3. *Type B Redundancy*

The second type of redundancy, namely the recurrence of the same event to a single person more than one times, is centered upon the liberation theme and revolves around Hercules, who already from the second book (2.454–549) finds himself confronted with a *belua, monstrum ingens* ("beast of monstrous bulk," 2.479) that threatens the life of Laomedon's daughter, Hesione. In order to underline the idea of suffering and liberation, Valerius deviates from the standard Apollonian plot: Hercules' rescue of Hesione, as well as Hercules' freeing of Prometheus, are not found in the Hellenistic epic.[48]

Hesione's liberation has been thought to be modeled upon Virgil's Hercules in his fight against Cacus (*Aen.* 8.219–267) and Andromeda's liberation in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (4.670–734).[49] And yet at several points, Valerius' narration bears also echoes of Virgil's *Georgics*.[50] Hesione's imminent death (*deserta durae / neci*, "abandoned to a cruel death," V. Fl. 2.455–456) is presented as definite as the natural death of human beings in the *Georgics* (*durae … inclementia mortis*, "stern death's ruthlessness," *G.* 3.68). Hesione's assimilation to a work of art (*exanimum ueluti … / maeret ebur, Pariusue nota et nomina sumit / cum lapis*, "just as when lifeless ivory … weeps, or Parian marble assumes man's lineaments and person," V. Fl. 2.465–467) is reminiscent of the *spirantia signa* in the *Georgics* (*stabunt et Parii lapides, spirantia signa*, "Parian marbles shall stand too, statues that breathe," *G.* 3.34) and thus makes her death seem almost real. The pestilence by which the Trojans are inflicted (… *morbi caeloque exacta sereno / temperies*, "… a sickness fell, and the temperate airs were driven from the clear sky," V. Fl. 2.475–476) is attributed to the quality of air, as in the *Georgics* (*morbo caeli*, "the sickened sky," *G.* 3.478). Similarly, Orion's chariot is described in similar terms (*bipedum flatu equorum*, "with the snorting of his two-hooved

[48] See Hershkowitz (1998) 194–196 and Zissos 2008, xxvi. Also noticeable is Bessone's argument (1991) that Valerius seems to have utilized more the Scholia to Apollonius rather than the Apollonius' text itself. See also Galli in this volume, pp. 148–151.

[49] Adamietz (1976) 39 n. 18; Hershkowitz (1998) 76 and n. 159.

[50] See Spaltenstein (2002) 436, 438–439, 441, 449–450.

horses," V. Fl. 2.508) as Proteus' chariot in the *Georgics* (*iuncto bipedum curru … equorum*, "with his chariot drawn by two-footed horses," *G*. 4.389). In imitating Virgil's *Georgics*, Valerius wishes to sketch out briefly the dominant circumstances in the Golden Age, when people are suffering under pestilence, abrupt death, and supernatural creatures or monsters. An outline of the misery of life in the Age of Saturn would render rather necessary the redemptory action taken by the *liberator* Heracles (2.543–544), who, like Pollux and the sons of Boreas, is prompted to action by the *fata* (2.446, 486).[51]

A second instance of the liberation theme can be recognized in the case of Prometheus. In Apollonius' treatment, we hear almost nothing about Prometheus, with the exception of a short description of his torture (A. R. 2.1246–1259). In the Flavian *Argonautica*, Valerius makes two separate scenes out of Prometheus' story: a first one in the fourth book with Hercules receiving the command (V. Fl. 4.60–81) to deliver Prometheus from bondage, and a second one with the execution of the command in book 5 (154–176). In both scenes Heracles is stimulated to action after Jupiter's decision (4.75) and the consent of the *fata* (4.156).

Thus Hercules turns out to be the agent of Jupiter's will, while Prometheus' salvation acquires a cosmic dimension: the whole cosmos shakes and trembles from the sky to the Underworld, first because of the Titan's complaint to Jupiter (4.71–74) and, afterwards, during his liberation (5.160–167). Moreover, the salvation of Prometheus and his reconciliation with Jupiter marks officially the end of an era and the advent of a new one: according to a famous tradition,[52] Prometheus, the *ignis fur*, is the inventor of crafts par excellence (*artes*) and the forerunner of the Jupiter's Age; "without Prometheus there would be no swords, no ploughs, no navigation—none of those tools which subjugate the natural world to human schemes of luxury and power."[53] At the end, it is agriculture and seafaring that put an end to the Golden Age, and that is the reason why Prometheus' salvation becomes emblematic of the Argo's civilizing voyage.

---

[51] See Adamietz (1976) 59.

[52] Aesch. *PV* 436–471; Virg. *G*. 1.129–138; Catul. 64.13–14. Edwards (1999) 156 supposes reasonably that Virgil draws on Catullus, who, in his turn, draws on Ennius.

[53] Edwards (1999) 156 and n. 15.

4. *Type C Redundancy: Jason and Hercules Interchangeable*

The third type of redundancy on the level of the plot displays several heroes sharing the same qualities or roles; this kind of redundancy is strongly supported by the ideological polarization,[54] which constitutes both a fundamental theme and an organizing principle of an ideological work: the heroes, in their story of confrontation, reincarnate the "good" guys (vs. the "bad" guys).[55] Valerius' *Argonautica* is not an epic revolving around a central hero, as the *Odyssey* or the *Aeneid*, but has to exhibit several characters who perform the same functions.

According to Paul Murgatroyd,[56] it is in the fourth book that "the Argonauts first start to grow as heroes: after showing fear and inertia (1.626 ff., 2.356 ff., 3.362 ff.) now they cope with Amycus, despite the absence Hercules, the first of their major exploits." Valerius' Argonauts, then, far from being the adventurers, the pernicious *turba* described by Apollonius, Ennius, Catullus and Ovid, they become the *defensores orbis*. In the place of the expected *conquistadores*, we read rather of *libertadores*, since, through the theme of monster, the theme of liberation, or the conflation of the two, this role is bestowed upon several Argonauts (Hercules, Pollux, the Boreades).

On the other side, in the frame of his restorative epicization, Jason with his spontaneous aid to the Doliones against the Pelasgians in the second book (2.659–662) demonstrates an unselfish heroic attitude, absent from the portrait of the Hellenistic Jason. Valerius' Jason will display the same heroic unselfishness at his arrival in Colchis (5.543–546) where the same dilemma to fight against or in favor of his new *hospes* will emerge *de nouveau*. Jason's welcoming by Aeetes as *e contrario* reduplication of Jason's welcoming by Cyzicus, as Marco Fucecchi argues, underlines that Jason's heroic attitude "ricorda il modello di Eracle, piuttosto che il Giasone di Apollonio."[57] Jason's re-epicization by Valerius draws mainly on Virgil's Aeneas, who, in his turn, is another Hercules.[58] Hence, on account of the redundancy of the episodes in which they are involved, Hercules and Jason should be read in the context of Valerius' *Argonautica* as interchangeable characters and, thus

---

54 Suleiman (1983) 69.

55 The same moralizing tendency (right side vs. wrong side) is also detectable in Valerius' accounts of civil strife; see Stover (2012) 114–116, esp. 114 and n. 6.

56 Murgatroyd (2009) 1. See also Finkmann in this volume, p. 86.

57 Fucecchi (1996) 120.

58 Adamietz (1976) 37–38 and Galli (2007a) 34–36.

redundant to each other (as in the Pelias-Jason and Laomedon-Hercules encounters). It is not surprising that Hercules' *aristeia* prevails in the first half of the epic,[59] while Jason's in the second.

5. *Conclusion: Aspects of Vespasianic Ideology*

Throughout the Flavian epic, the civilizing and redemptory role of Argo's expedition, and through it, of Vespasian's regime, endorses the intended meaning of the epic. The deliverance of Hesione, Phineus, and Prometheus, the punishment of Amycus, the Clashing Rocks, or the revenge taken on Aeetes, even the recovery of the Golden Fleece, aim at the restoration of justice, of ethical or physical order. On a structural level the insistent occurrence of the "restoration" theme that necessitates redemptory action on the part of the Argonauts, is intertextually strengthened by the adherence to Virgil's didactic epic. In this respect, the poem portrays the return of the heroic labor under Jupiter's reign as a close parallel to the Flavians' reformative attempt to restore Augustan values, thus ensuring the intertextual alignment of Vespasian with Augustus.

After a century from the battle of Actium, Vespasian comes to reinforce the established regime of the principate in 70 CE and give, as Augustus does before him, to the peoples of the Roman Empire a century of undisturbed peace. On his arrival in Rome, he confirms that he stands for order and peace;[60] the picture of the plebeian emperor carting away rubbish on his shoulder while clearing the site for the new Capitol,[61] recalls the Augustan imagery of Aeneas' carrying his father on his shoulders.

Therefore, Valerius' intertextual allusions reflect on Vespasian's wishful thinking to appear as the new Augustus. By the end of 70 CE, like Augustus, Vespasian ceremonially closes the Temple of Janus, pointing to the end of the civil wars. In addition, Valerius' insistence on the restoration of justice, on the notion of salvation and liberation in the various types of redundancy, proves to be consonant with the coins of 70–71 CE that promote the propaganda of PAX AVGVSTA, the LIBERTAS PVBLICA, and the LIBERTAS

---

59 Not surprisingly, Hercules is presented as *ductor* (2.468) just as Jason himself (1.240, 296). On the difficulties with *ductor*, see Spaltenstein (2002) 439–440 and Galli in this volume, pp. 149–150.

60 Tac. *Hist.* 4.52. See Levi (1975) 196.

61 Suet. *Vesp.* 8.5; cf. Tac. *Hist.* 4.53 and Charlesworth (1954) 5.

RESTITVTA; some among them praise "the civilians' salvation," (S.P.Q.R. OB CIVES SERVATOS) or represent Vespasian as "defender of the public liberty" (S.P.Q.R. ADSERTOR LIBERTATIS PVBLICAE).[62]

[62] Mattingly and Sydenham (1926) 64–74 and no. 400, 403, 405, 410–411, 429–430, 434–439, 455, 457–459, 474, 429–493, 515. Cf. Taylor (1994) 434–435 and Levi (1975) 193, who underlines the importance of the *eirenopoios* or *restitutor libertatis* that Vespasian claims for himself.

PART III

STATIUS

TRAGIC / EPIC: STATIUS' *THEBAID* AND EURIPIDES' *HYPSIPYLE*

Jörn Soerink

> Though admirable in all, [Statius] principally excels in the mournful and pathetic. He is the same among the Romans, as Euripides among the Greeks.
>
> – (Lewis [1773] xv)

1. *Introduction*

Statius' *Thebaid* reworks several tragedies, such as Aeschylus' *Septem*, Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*, and Euripides' *Phoenissae*, not to mention Seneca's plays. The Flavian epic is profoundly tragic on a different level too: its disturbing poetic universe is more like Seneca's inescapable world of *nefas* than the teleological world of Virgilian epic.[1] This paper examines Statius' engagement with one particular tragedy, namely Euripides' *Hypsipyle*, in the Nemean episode (4.646–7.104). Previous research on this intertextual relationship has been dominated by the question *if* Statius has used the *Hypsipyle*; I aim to explore *how* he has used it.[2] Before we turn our attention to Statius, however, let us look briefly at the Greek play.

2. *Euripides'* Hypsipyle

Of all fragmentary Greek plays, Euripides' *Hypsipyle* (412–406 BCE) is the least fragmentary,[3] thanks to a spectacular discovery of Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt in Oxyrhynchus in 1906, romantically described in

---

[1] On Statius and Greek tragedy, see Heslin (2008), Smolenaars (2008), and Hulls in this volume, pp. 193–213. On Statius' *Thebaid* and Seneca, see Augoustakis (2014).

[2] A more comprehensive discussion will be part of my dissertation on *Theb.* 5.499–753 (in progress).

[3] Collard-Cropp (2008) 255.

one of their reports.[4] The papyrus (*P. Oxy*. VI 852), produced in the reign of Domitian (81–96 CE), contains three complete columns of 60 lines each and numerous smaller fragments. It covers substantial parts of the first half of the play; the second half is less well-preserved. On the basis of stichometric line numbering it has been calculated that the play counted ca. 1750 lines (30 columns). The papyrus also has *paragraphoi* indicating a change of speaker, sometimes even naming the *dramatis personae*. In combination with other evidence, especially from the mythographers, the papyrus has enabled scholars to reconstruct the play with some precision. After two Dutch editions,[5] in 1963 Godfrey Bond produced the first English edition with commentary. Bond's reconstruction was improved by W.E.H. Cockle: on the basis of a technical re-examination of the papyri, involving microscopic analysis of fiber structures and worm cut patterns, Cockle made 46 new joints. His reconstruction underlies the most recent editions of the *Hypsipyle*.[6]

Although the reconstruction of the play is not without problems, the main events are clear.[7] As the title indicates, its heroine is Hypsipyle, daughter of Thoas and granddaughter of Dionysus. In the Euripidean version, her background is as follows (fr. 759a): when the Argonauts visited Lemnos, Hypsipyle bore twin sons to Jason, Euneus and Thoas, whom Jason took with him to Colchis. After the Argonauts had left, the Lemnian women massacred the male inhabitants of the island. Since Hypsipyle had refused to kill her father, she had to flee. Seized by pirates, she was sold into slavery to Lycurgus, priest of Zeus in Nemea, where she became wet-nurse to Opheltes, infant son of Lycurgus and Eurydice. In the meantime, Jason died, and Euneus and Thoas were raised by Orpheus in Thrace. There they were reunited with their grandfather Thoas and returned with him to Lemnos. When they found their mother missing, they set out to find her.

In the prologue, Euneus and Thoas arrive in Nemea, at the exact moment when the Seven march through Nemea on their way to Thebes. Lingering before the palace with her nursling Opheltes in her arms, Hypsipyle admits the two young men to the house, without recognizing them as her sons. Then Amphiaraus makes his appearance. He needs fresh water for a sacrifice, and Hypsipyle guides him to a spring. There Opheltes is killed by a

---

[4] See Cockle (1987) 21.

[5] Van Herwerden (1909) and Italie (1923).

[6] Collard, Cropp, and Gibert (2004^2) and (2008); Kannicht (2004). The following discussion is based on the most recent Loeb edition (2008), although I have often consulted Cockle's and Bond's valuable editions.

[7] See Cockle (1987) 39–40, 44–49; Collard and Cropp (2008) 250–255.

serpent. When she returns to the house, Opheltes' mother Eurydice wants to put Hypsipyle to death. But Amphiaraus persuades Eurydice to accept the situation: he interprets Opheltes' death as an omen for the Argive expedition and renames him Archemorus ("Beginner of Doom"). He also orders funeral games to be held in his honor: the first Nemean Games. Euneus and Thoas participate in the games, which somehow leads to their recognition and to the joyful reunion of Hypsipyle with her sons. At the end of the play, Dionysus appears as *deus ex machina*, probably to sanction the reunion, and to order their return to Lemnos.

3. *Status Quaestionis*

Although there are some striking differences, the events in Statius' Nemean episode are essentially the same: the Seven meet Hypsipyle; she guides them to a spring; Opheltes is killed by a serpent; there is a confrontation with one of Opheltes' parents; Amphiaraus interprets the child's fate as a portent for the expedition against Thebes and renames him Archemorus; games are celebrated in his honor; and Hypsipyle is happily reunited with her sons. The first question that poses itself, then, is whether or not Statius has used Euripides' play in composing his Nemean episode.

Before the publication of the papyrus in 1908, most scholars were inclined to believe that Statius had indeed modeled his episode on Euripides.[8] Otto Ribbeck asserts that "[a]uch für die Episode, welche die Argiverhelden mit Hypsipyle erleben ... hat Statius eine Tragödie, die gleichnamige des Euripides benutzt, deren Bruchstücke noch denselben Gang der Handlung erkennen lassen";[9] and E. Eissfeldt even claims that "die Fabel dieses Stückes ... zeigt *nicht die geringste Abweichung* von der Darstellung in der *Thebais*."[10] These judgments, however, were based on nothing but a handful of fragments and the mythographers,[11] and one cannot escape the impression that these scholars did not even consider the possibility of Flavian poets like Statius being original.

Surprisingly perhaps, after the publication of the papyrus, scholarly opinion remained more divided than before. According to some, the papyrological evidence proved that Statius had indeed imitated Euripides. H.W.

8 See Reussner (1921) 37.
9 Ribbeck (1892) 229.
10 Eissfeldt (1904) 421, my italics.
11 For the mythographical sources, see Bond (1963) 147–149.

Fortgens, for instance, claimed that Statius had *ante oculos* Euripides' *Hypsipyle*, suggesting that Statius is rather dependent on the Greek tragedian.[12] Others laid emphasis on the differences and denied that Statius had used the Euripidean play at all.[13] We should bear in mind, however, that most of these scholars were not primarily interested in Statius, but in the recently discovered *Hypsipyle*: the debate was really about the question whether or not it is legitimate to use Statius' *Thebaid* in reconstructing the Euripidean play, as J.A. Hartung had already attempted in the nineteenth century.[14]

The first scholar that studied the relationship between Statius and Euripides rather than that between Euripides and Statius, so to speak, is Alfred Reussner in his 1921 dissertation *De Statio et Euripide*. Reussner calls attention to several similarities on both the macro- and the micro-level, though careful to point out some differences as well.[15] His conclusion is that Statius indeed used Euripides: *itaque cum totius narrationis institutione tum singulis locis cum Euripide congruentibus probari mihi uidetur in libris IV et V componendis huius poetae Hypsipylam Statium manu habuisse*.[16]

The question was further examined in detail by Giuseppe Aricò in 1961 and D.W.T.C. Vessey in 1970. Interestingly, they reached diametrically opposing conclusions. Like Reussner, Aricò argues that Statius indeed uses Euripides: "i confronti istituiti dimostrano, crediamo senza possibilità di dubbio, la reale entità dei debiti di Stazio nei riguardi del dramma euripideo," although he stresses that Statius does not slavishly follow his model and also makes use of other sources.[17] Vessey, on the other hand, is sceptical: "a careful analysis of these supposed parallels cannot inspire one with any feeling of certainty that Statius made use of the Euripidean drama."[18] Most recently, Joanne Brown has made some observations on Statius' use of Euripides' *Hypsipyle* in her 1994 dissertation,[19] although her chapter on Statius and Euripides is in fact largely devoted to other questions, such as the possible trilogy *Hypsipyle-Phoenissae-Antiope*.[20] Where appropriate, her observations are incorporated in the following discussion.

[12] Fortgens (1934) 10–11; cf. Reussner (1921) 37–38.
[13] See Reussner (1921) 37–38; cf. Aricò (1961) 56 n. 3.
[14] Hartung (1844) 430–442.
[15] Reussner (1921) 37–44.
[16] Reussner (1921) 44.
[17] Aricò (1961) 60.
[18] Vessey (1970) 51.
[19] Brown (1994, unpublished) 57–93.
[20] Brown (1994) 65–69.

4. *Verbal Parallels*

To illustrate the difficulties involved, I shall discuss two vexed parallels between Statius and Euripides that figure in the scholarly debate between Aricò and Vessey.

(a) One of the most striking similarities is the description of Orpheus singing to his fellow Argonauts while leaning against the mast of the Argo:

> … μέσῳ δὲ παρ' ἱστῷ
> Ἀσιάδ' ἔλεγον ἰήϊον
> Θρῇσσ' ἐβόα κίθαρις {'Ορφέως}
> μακροπόλων πιτύλων
> ἐρέταισι κελεύσματα μελπομένα,
> τότε μὲν ταχύπλουν,
> τότε δ' εἰλατίνας ἀνάπαυμα πλάτα[ς. (Eur. *Hyps*. fr. 752g.8–14)

> … and by the mast amidships the Thracian lyre cried out a mournful Asian plaint, singing commands to the rowers for their long-sweeping strokes, now fast ahead, now at rest from the pinewood oar.

> mitior et senibus cygnis et pectine Phoebi
> uox media de puppe uenit, maria ipsa carinae
> accedunt. post nosse datum est: Oeagrius illic
> adclinis malo mediis intersonat Orpheus
> remigiis tantosque iubet nescire labores. (Stat. *Theb*. 5.341–345)

> A voice gentler than aged swans and Phoebus' quill comes from the vessel's midst and the very waters draw near the ship. Later we came to learn: there Oeagrian Orpheus leaning against the mast makes music amid the rowers and bids them forget their heavy toils.

The parallel, already noted by Reussner,[21] is striking. As Aricò observes,[22] *adclinis malo* corresponds closely with Euripides' μέσῳ δὲ παρ' ἱστῷ, while Statius' *mediis intersonat Orpheus / remigiis* paraphrases Θρῇσσ' ἐβόα κίθαρις {'Ορφέως} … ἐρέταισι κελεύσματα μελπομένα. We may add that μέσῳ is verbally echoed in *media*, while κελεύσματα recurs in *iubet*, with a typical inversion: in Euripides Orpheus "commands" the rowers' labor, in Statius his music "commands" them *to forget* it. Vessey is sceptical and points to other descriptions of Orpheus singing on the Argo in Apollonius Rhodius

21 Reussner (1921) 39–40.
22 Aricò (1961) 61–62.

and Valerius Flaccus.[23] In my opinion, the similarities cannot be accidental: not only because of the verbal similarities, but also because both poets put these words in the mouth of Hypsipyle.[24]

(b) Aricò also sees a connection between the beginning of Hypsipyle's embedded narrative in Statius (*Aegaeo premitur circumflua Nereo / Lemnos*, "Aegean Nereus surrounds the island of Lemnos," *Theb*. 5.49–50) and the following lines of Euripides, in which the chorus of local women ask Hypsipyle what is on her mind:

> … μναμοσύνα δέ σοι
> τᾶς ἀγχιάλοιο Λήμνου,
> τὰν Αἰγαῖος ἑλί[σ]σων
> κυμοκτύπος ἀχεῖ; (Eur. *Hyps*. fr. 752 f.25–28)
>
> And does your memory dwell on Lemnos lying by the sea, which the Aegean encircles and beats with echoing waves?

Aricò argues that "[l]a concordanza verbale, la precisa corrispondenza di *circumflua* ad ἀγχιάλοιο, di *premitur* ad ἑλίσσων … ἀχεῖ sembrano escludere che si tratti soltanto di un τόπος."[25] Indeed, it is tempting to believe that the *incipit* of Hypsipyle's tale recalls Euripides, that Statius' Hypsipyle remembers her Euripidean memory (μναμοσύνα), mother of the Muses, right when she embarks on her epic narrative. On the other hand, *circumfluus*, which has numerous parallels in Latin epic,[26] translates περίρρυτος rather than ἀγχίαλος, and may recall Sophocles (*Ph*. 1–2) rather than Euripides.

More parallels could be added to the list, but these examples will suffice to illustrate the difficulties in establishing verbal connections. Vessey, as we have seen, does not believe that Statius alludes to Euripides on the verbal level. Yet he does Statius an injustice when he claims that "[i]t is clear enough that the use which an epic writer could make of tragedy is limited."[27] For even if the verbal parallels carry little conviction, Statius' engagement with the *Hypsipyle* shows clearly in terms of plot, characterization, and *mise en scène*—if we may use this term with respect to epic narrative. For

23 Vessey (1970) 50.

24 Cf. Mauri (1999) 188: "questo passo sembra derivare direttamente dalle *Ipsipile* di Euripide"—without references, although Aricò (1961) is in his bibliography.

25 Aricò (1961) 65; cf. also *Theb*. 5.56.

26 See Mauri (1999) 68.

27 Vessey (1970) 48. For the underpinnings of the debate, cf. Ahl (1986) 2815 with n. 21; his meta-scholarly remarks on the debate Statius / Antimachus can also be applied to the debate Statius / Euripides.

one thing, it would be very difficult to explain the presence of the reunion scene (*Theb.* 5.710–730) without Euripides. Like other modern scholars,[28] I am convinced that Statius uses Euripides' *Hypsipyle*. In light of Statius' extensive use of other Greek tragedies, there is no reason to suppose that the poet—born and bred in bilingual Naples as the son of an expert on Greek literature—should not know the play. In fact, we know that the *Hypsipyle* was popular in Roman times: there is evidence for performances,[29] and there are several visual representations, including a wall-painting from Herculaneum which, potentially, Statius may have seen with his own eyes.[30]

5. *"Bacchic Frame"*

Statius has incorporated the plot of Euripides' *Hypsipyle* into his epic narrative. Structurally, his model for the conflation of epic and tragedy is the Dido episode in Virgil's *Aeneid*, with Hypsipyle's embedded narrative in *Thebaid* 5 echoing Aeneas' in *Aeneid* 2 and 3.[31] As scholars have long observed, Virgil repeatedly flags the tragic nature of his Dido episode: the bay of Carthage is called *scaena* (*Aen.* 1.162), which programmatically heralds that the events in Carthage will unfold in dramatic fashion; Venus is wearing buskins (*Aen.* 1.337); the Carthaginians are building a theatre (*Aen.* 1.427–429); and in book 4 Dido is famously compared to Pentheus and Orestes on stage (*Aen.* 4.469–473).[32]

When the Seven reach Nemea—and when Statius' narrative enters the realm of Euripidean tragedy—we find something similar, as Brown has argued.[33] In the second half of *Thebaid* 4, at the beginning of the Nemean episode, Bacchus makes his appearance, in order to delay the expedition against Thebes. Why does Statius assign such an important role to Bacchus here? The most obvious answer to that question is that Bacchus enables Statius to connect the story of the Seven with the story of Hypsipyle, since the god is mythically connected with both Thebes and Hypsipyle. Indeed, Bacchus' intervention has an impact on both: it delays the expedition

28 Brown (1994) 57–93; Parkes (2012) on *Theb.* 4.652–679; Ganiban (2007) 76 n. 17: "potential influence."

29 See Cockle (1987) 41–42.

30 See Pache (2004) 123; *LIMC* 2.1 (1984) 473 nr. 3.

31 See Gruzelier (1994) and Ganiban (2007) 71–95 with references.

32 On Virgil and tragedy, see e.g. Quinn (1968); Hardie (1997); Panoussi (2009).

33 Brown (1994) 57–59.

against his city, and it leads to the reunion of his granddaughter with her sons.[34] But Bacchus' appearance in *Thebaid* 4 has metapoetical significance as well. In the words of Brown, "Bacchus' prologue-like speech strongly suggests that, generically, the narrative will be re-directed towards tragedy."[35] After all, Bacchus is the patron god of tragedy. Thus his intervention in *Thebaid* 4 can be seen to have the same function as the bay of Carthage (*scaena*) or Venus' buskins in the *Aeneid*: they signal, metapoetically, that the following episode will be tragic in nature.

Brown goes on to argue that Bacchus' appearance alludes to Euripides' *Bacchae*. Admittedly, there are elements in Statius' text that may trigger associations with Dionysus' appearance at the beginning of that play.[36] What Brown fails to observe, however, is that Bacchus also figures prominently in the opening scene of Statius' principal model, Euripides' *Hypsipyle*: the prologue of the play, spoken by Hypsipyle, begins with an invocation of Dionysus, the very first word being the god's name:

> Διόνυσος, ὃς θύρσοισι καὶ νεβρῶν δοραῖς
> καθαπτὸς ἐν πεύκαισι Παρνασσὸν κάτα
> πηδᾷ χορεύων παρθένοις σὺν Δελφίσιν ... (Eur. *Hyps*. fr. 752)
>
> Dionysus, who girded with thyrsuses and fawnskins leaps in the torch-lit dance across Parnassus with the girls of Delphi ...

And the next fragment (fr. 752a) shows the continued importance of Dionysus in the rest of the prologue speech. The appearance of Bacchus at the beginning of Statius' Nemean episode, then, could also be seen as an epic version of the Dionysiac prologue of Euripides' *Hypsipyle*.

At the end of *Thebaid* 5, Bacchus makes a second appearance.[37] When Hypsipyle has been reunited with her sons, Bacchus makes the heavens resound with maenadic cries, drums, and cymbals, as "a sign that it is his hand that has produced the miracle":[38]

> addita signa polo, laetoque ululante tumultu
> tergaque et aera dei motas crepuere per auras. (Stat. *Theb*. 5.729–730)

[34] Vessey (1970) 48–49.

[35] Brown (1994) 59.

[36] Brown (1994) 58. She also sees a connection with the *Bacchae* in the theme of maternal suffering and Bacchus' use of *fraus* (*Theb*. 4.677).

[37] Bacchus also figures in Hypsipyle's Lemnian narrative, where he appears to save Hypsipyle and Thoas (*Theb*. 5.265–286).

[38] Vessey (1973) 190. Whether Hypsipyle and the Argives recognize the god's sign remains unclear; see Brown (1994) 60 and Georgacopoulou (2005) 131.

> Signs too were manifest in heaven, cries of tumultuous joy and the drums and cymbals of the god crashed through the resonant air.

Before the publication of the papyrus, Legras had already written that Bacchus' celestial signs are reminiscent of the finale of a Euripidean tragedy.[39] And indeed, the papyrus shows that in Euripides' *Hypsipyle*, immediately after the reunion scene, Dionysus appears as *deus ex machina*![40] If Bacchus' appearance in book 4 can be related to Euripides' prologue, then these lines can be seen as Statius' epic version of Bacchus' appearance at the end of the *Hypsipyle*.

At this point in Statius' narrative, one could say, the plot of Euripides' drama is complete. Like Euripides' *Hypsipyle*, Statius' Nemean episode frames the events surrounding Hypsipyle with two manifestations of the god Dionysus. This "Bacchic frame" is reinforced by verbal echoes, for *Theb.* 5.729–730 constitutes an inverted echo of his entrance in book 4, where the god orders the music to be silent (4.668–669).[41] The vocabulary also echoes the description of the riots in Nemea,[42] which underlines that the cries of fear have become cries of joy—not unlike Hypsipyle's tears of sorrow have become tears of joy (5.728).[43]

Some important events of Euripides' play do not take place within this "tragic frame," but are transposed. In the first place, the scene in which Amphiaraus interprets Opheltes' death as an ill omen for the Argive expedition and renames him Archemorus is postponed to the very end of the book (5.731–753), after the epiphany of Dionysus. The scene is most important, as it provides the link between the events in Nemea and the larger plot of the *Thebaid*; its placement, immediately after the completion of the Euripidean plot, underscores precisely that function. The scene also makes a smooth transition to book 6, which is devoted to the funeral of Opheltes and the celebration of the first Nemean Games. In Euripides' tragedy, these games were probably narrated by a messenger (see below, Section 6); in

---

39 Legras (1905) 72 n. 1.

40 The appearance of Dionysus is guaranteed by the speaker notation διονυσ at about line 1673; see Cockle (1987) 125 fr. 64 iii.41 and Collard and Cropp (2008) 316–317.

41 Georgacopoulou (2005) 132 n. 70 sees ring composition with 4.753–754, where the Seven mistake Hypsipyle for a goddess.

42 *ululante*, 729 ~ *ululatibus*, 697; *tumultu*, 729 ~ *tumultus*, 692; *terga*, 730 ~ *terga*, 698 (although used in a different sense).

43 Augoustakis (2010a) 57 suggests that "[t]he word pairing of *ululante tumultu* … anticipates Eurydice's lament in 6.137 (*longis … ululatibus*), as the cries of joy and of grief set off one another in the context of Opheltes' death and of Hypsipyle's reunion with her sons."

Statius' epic poem, they deserve a separate book.[44] In book 6, in the context of Opheltes' funeral, we also encounter Eurydice. As a result of Statius' decision to favor the traditional epic confrontation between Lycurgus and the Seven over the Euripidean *agon* between Hypsipyle and Opheltes' mother (see below, Section 8), Eurydice does scarcely figure in Statius' "tragedy." In book 6, however, she appears after all, and adds her voice to the chorus of bereaved women that populate the *Thebaid*.[45] Adrastus' *consolatio* to Opheltes' father (6.46–50), Reussner has suggested,[46] may also take its inspiration from Euripides' play, where Amphiaraus sooths Eurydice (Eur. *Hyps.* fr. 757.122–128).[47]

6. *Reunion Scene*

The reunion scene (Stat. *Theb.* 5.710–728), which leads to Bacchus' celestial signs, is most remarkable. After the gruesome death of Opheltes and its aftermath—the conflict between Lycurgus and the Seven, the near hostilities in Nemea—the penultimate scene of the book takes an unexpected turn and narrates the joyful reunion of Hypsipyle with her sons, Euneus and Thoas. The happiness of the scene contrasts starkly with the sad and grim atmosphere of what precedes.[48] Whereas Euripides' play is directed from the very beginning towards the joyful reunion of Hypsipyle with her sons, in Statius' *Thebaid* it comes like a surprise, for Statius' audience as well as for Hypsipyle, who had abandoned all hope that Bacchus would come to her rescue.[49] Although Legras is mistaken when he writes that they have not been mentioned before,[50] Euneus and Thoas indeed have not played any role

[44] On Statius' games, see Lovatt (2005).

[45] Brown (1994) 80 observes that "Eurydice's extravagant grief contrasts with the relative coherence and articulacy of the tragic mother."

[46] Reussner (1921) 43–44; cf. Augoustakis (2010a) 58 n. 60: "Statius' Adrastus replays the Euripidean Amphiaraus' consolation to Eurydice …; the Flavian poet, however, transfers the pair lamentation-consolation to men."

[47] Aricò (1961) 66 agrees that the passage may have provided Statius with the idea of introducing a *consolatio*, although he stresses that such *consolationes* were a favorite topos in classical literature, and that Statius' phrasing owes more to Virgil than to Euripides.

[48] Cf. Helm (1892) 174: *terribili igitur illi scaenae poeta finem addit laetum et placidum*. Line 5.711, with the word *inopina* and the oxymoron *gaudia maestae*, underscores precisely that.

[49] See 5.292–293 with Ganiban (2007) 84; cf. also 5.496.

[50] Hypsipyle mentions her children in 5.463–467.

in the narrative so far. We did not even know they were in town. The scene comes as a complete surprise—unless one is familiar with the *Hypsipyle*.

Undoubtedly, as critics have long observed,[51] the reunion takes its inspiration from Euripides. Of the corresponding scene in the play one substantial fragment of fifty-five complete lines survives (Eur. *Hyps*. fr. 759a): in this fragment Amphiaraus makes his farewell and departs for Thebes, after which Hypsipyle and Euneus—Thoas is *mutus*—exchange some of their earlier experiences. This fragment must have followed the actual ἀναγνώρισις, which unfortunately cannot be reconstructed with certainty. In all likelihood, however, the recognition follows from the participation of Euneus and Thoas in the games, as the Vatican Mythographer suggests:[52]

> quibus ludis Hisiphile duo filii, quos ex Iasone habuit, intererant, quos fugiens reliquit in Lemno, qui et ipsi matrem quaerentes currendo uicerunt. quorum nomina praeco cum pronunciasset Iasonis et Hisiphiles filios esse, mater eos cognouit, quam agnitam exorato rege mox Lemnum reduxerunt.
>
> (*Myth. Vat*. 2.164)

> Jason's two sons by Hypsipyle were present at these games. She had left them on Lemnos when she fled, and they were now seeking their mother. They prevailed in running races, and when the herald announced their names as sons of Jason and Hypsipyle, their mother knew them. After they recognized her and persuaded the king, they soon took her back to Lemnos.

The *praeco* ("herald") must be a messenger, who narrates the first celebration of the Nemean Games on stage. When he proclaims Euneus and Thoas as victors, he facilitates the recognition.[53] But how does Statius bring about the recognition? Let us have look at the text:

> quis superum tanto solatus funera uoto
> pensauit lacrimas inopinaque gaudia maestae
> rettulit Hypsipylae? tu gentis conditor, Euhan,
> qui geminos iuuenes Lemni de litore uectos
> intuleras Nemeae mirandaque fata parabas.
> causa uiae genetrix, nec inhospita tecta Lycurgi
> praebuerant aditus ... (Stat. *Theb*. 5.710–716)

> Which of the High Ones solaced her calamity, balancing her tears with an answer to her great prayer, and brought back unlooked-for joy to sad Hypsipyle? You it was, Euhan, founder of the family, who had brought the two

51 Legras (1905) 71–72 and 155 n. 3.
52 See Friedrich (1934) 301–302. Cf. also Hyg. *Fab*. 273.
53 See Collard, Cropp, and Gibert (2004²) 175 on the Pindaric scholia which suggest that Amphiaraus is also involved in the recognition.

> youths from Lemnos' shore to Nemea, preparing a wondrous destiny. Their mother was the reason for their journey and the hospitable dwelling of Lycurgus had given them entry …

Statius begins with an expository question (710–712): although such questions are a frequent narratorial device,[54] one cannot escape the impression that Statius is playing with the expectations of his audience. The answer, namely Bacchus, reminds us of the god's presence in Nemea, something we might have forgotten in the course of the book. Then, in less than two lines (715–716), Statius summarizes the events of Euripides' prologue, in which Hypsipyle welcomes her sons into the royal palace of Nemea (Eur. *Hyps*. fr. 752d–e). Note that Statius suppresses the names Euneus and Thoas, expecting his audience to be familiar with Euripides.[55]

As we have seen, Statius has transposed the games to book 6. As a result, the Euripidean scenario, in which the recognition somehow follows from Euneus' and Thoas' participation in the games, is not possible in Statius' version. What is the Flavian poet's solution?

> … et protinus ille tyranno
> nuntius extinctae miserando uulnere prolis.
> ergo adsunt comites (pro fors et caeca futuri
> mens hominum!) regique fauent; sed Lemnos ad aures
> ut primum dictusque Thoas, per tela manusque
> irruerunt, matremque auidis complexibus ambo
> diripiunt flentes alternaque pectora mutant. (Stat. *Theb*. 5.716–722)
>
> 721 *irruerunt* Gronovius
>
> … when the report reached the king of his offspring piteously killed. So they are there as his companions and (oh chance and men's minds blind to the future!) support the king. But as soon as Lemnos and Thoas' name come to their ears, they rush through weapons and hands and, both weeping, tear their mother apart with greedy embraces, taking her to their bosoms in turn.

The narrative is dense, so let us first establish what happens. Euneus and Thoas are in the palace of Nemea when news of Opheltes' death arrives. When Lycurgus seeks to avenge his son and kill Hypsipyle, the two youths follow him in support. We are invited to imagine Hypsipyle's sons shouting for the execution of their own mother, dramatic irony in Euripidean fashion.

---

54 Cf., e.g., *Theb*. 5.534–535 and V. Fl. 8.259–260.

55 Cf. Georgacopoulou (2005) 129: "Stace préfère présenter les deux frères dans un catalogue épique et non dans la scène de la reconnaissance qui le précède." They are first named in 6.340–345; cf. also 6.133–134, 464–466, 476. Newlands (2012) 42 n. 172 erroneously claims that Euneus "is not even given a name in Statius' epic."

In the tumultuous confrontation between the Seven and Lycurgus *cum suis*, however, Euneus and Thoas overhear the names "Lemnos" and "Thoas," which make them realize that the woman under threat is, in fact, their own mother. These names have indeed been mentioned: "Lemnos" is spoken by Lycurgus when he threatens Hypsipyle (5.658), and "Thoas" is mentioned by Tydeus (5.675).

The word *nuntius* looks back intratextually to the earlier scene in which the news of Opheltes' death arrives in the palace of Nemea (*et iam sacrifici subitus per tecta Lycurgi / nuntius implerat lacrimis ipsumque domumque*, "and now a sudden report that ran through the dwelling of Lycurgus as he was at sacrifice filled himself and the house with tears," 5.638–639). At the same time, however, it forms an allusion to the messenger (*nuntius*) in Euripides' *Hypsipyle*, which leads to the reunion of mother and sons. The word thus recalls the Euripidean model in order to highlight Statius' deviation from the tragic model. The embrace may be taken from Euripides' *Hypsipyle*: περίβαλλ', ὦ τέκνον, ὠλένας ("throw your arms around me, my child!" fr. 765a).[56] But in Statius the affectionate gesture is troubled by *auidis* and the violent verb *diripiunt*,[57] while *alternaque … mutant* is disturbingly reminiscent of Eteocles and Polynices (cf. 1.138–139, 10.800–801). Are we invited to compare Hypsipyle's sons with Eteocles and Polynices, both eager to hold, both unable to share?

Unfortunately, Euripides' recognition scene does not survive. Hence some aspects of Statius' engagement with the *Hypsipyle* in this passage may elude us. What we do know, however, is that Statius brings about the recognition differently, in accordance with the traditional epic confrontation between Lycurgus and the Seven (see below, Section 8). It is also clear that Statius deliberately rushes through the events; the reunion scene comes almost as an afterthought. For the narrative of the Seven against Thebes, of course, the characters of Euneus and Thoas are of little importance, and his nimble narration seems to acknowledge precisely that. Statius' audience, familiar with Euripides, would smile at his compression of his literary

56 Collard and Cropp (2008) categorize the fragment as unplaced, although they note that it is "[a]lmost certainly from the recognition scene." Although we should be most careful in reconstructing Euripides on the basis of Statius, the parallel adds credibility to their suggestion.

57 In Statius even affectionate gestures contain the seeds of violence. Cf. 3.294, where Mars "does harm to Venus even when he gets sexy with her" (Hershkowitz [1997] 46); the embrace of Jocasta and Polynices in 7.493–496 with the "rather drastic expression" *raptam* (Smolenaars [1994] 228); and 2.244.

model—a smile that would be reinforced, perhaps, by associations with Roman comedy,[58] where a recognition scene often "solves the complications and brings the comedy to its happy conclusion."[59]

7. *Hypsipyle as Epic Poet*

Georgia Nugent, Bruce Gibson, and others have called attention to Statius' characterization of Hypsipyle as a poet figure: Hypsipyle narrates the story of the Lemnian massacre as a skilled poet, and she even voices her poetic ambitions (5.626–627).[60] We are reminded of Apollonius, where Hypsipyle also narrates her fraudulent story (A. R. 1.793–833), and of *Heroides* 6, although Ovid endows her with an elegiac, not an epic voice.[61] Valerius Flaccus casts the Lemnian massacre in a third-person narrative, although his Hypsipyle does weave her story into a cloak (V. Fl. 2.408–417), a well-known metaphor for poetic composition. Perhaps Statius alludes to Valerius' cloak when his Hypsipyle begins her narrative with the phrase *quid longa malis exordia necto?* ("why do I weave a long preamble to a tale of woe?" Stat. *Theb*. 5.36).[62]

It is important to stress, however, that Hypsipyle is cast as an epic poet already in Euripides.[63] In fr. 752 f., which covers the end of the prologue and the beginning of the *parodos*, the chorus of local Nemean women address Hypsipyle and ask why she is lingering at the doorway of the house. They suggest several possibilities: sweeping the entrance, sprinkling water on the ground, or

ἢ τὰν Ἀργὼ τὰν διὰ σοῦ
στόματος αἰεὶ κληζομέναν

[58] Cf. Legras (1905) 155 n. 3: "il est vraisemblable que les Romains aimaient les scènes de reconnaissance, si nombreuses dans leur ancien théâtre." Lactantius Placidus comments on 5.718–719 that the recognition scene is reminiscent of comedy ("*eleganter more comoediae contigit agnitio filiorum*"), and on 5.728 he adduces a parallel from Terence (*Ad*. 409). The emphasis on θαῦμα and fate (5.714 *mirandaque fata*, 718 *fors*) is also typical of such scenes in comedy.

[59] Duckworth (1994^2) 217.

[60] See Nugent (1996) and Gibson (2004).

[61] Cf. Augoustakis (2010a) 32: "The middle of the *Thebaid* is transformed into an extensive *Herois*, borrowing a well-known script from Ovid upon which Hypsipyle embroiders her personal, post-Ovidian story."

[62] Dietrich (1999) 49 and Newlands (2012) 41. Ganiban (2007) 91 n. 74 suggests that Valerius' cloak "might also have suggested to Statius the potential of having Hypsipyle herself narrate the Lemnian massacre." On the cloak's ekphrasis, see most recently Augoustakis (2012b).

[63] Cf. Ganiban (2007) 76 n. 17: "The Euripidean tragedy makes it certain … that Hypsipyle herself had a habit of telling tales about the Argonauts, though we cannot be sure that such a tale made up part of the *Hypsipyle* itself."

> πεντηκόντερον ᾄδεις,
> ἢ τὸ χρυσεόμαλλον
> ἱερὸν δέρος ὃ περὶ δρυὸς
> ὄζοις ὄμμα δράκοντος
> φρουρεῖ, μναμοσύνα δέ σοι
> τᾶς ἀγχιάλοιο Λήμνου,
> τὰν Αἰγαῖος ἑλί[σ]σων
> κυμοκτύπος ἀχεῖ; (Eur. *Hyps*. fr. 752 f.19–28)
>
> Are you singing now of Argo, that fifty-oared vessel that your voice is always celebrating, or the sacred Golden Fleece which the eye of the serpent, coiled around the boughs of the tree, keeps under guard? And does your memory dwell on Lemnos lying by the sea, which the Aegean encircles and beat with echoing waves?

The Argo, the Golden Fleece, the Colchian serpent, Lemnos—apparently Hypsipyle is fond of telling the story of the Argonauts; the word αἰεί suggests that the chorus have heard the story more than once before.[64] The vocabulary evokes the epic genre: note the verb ᾄδεις and the compound adjectives χρυσεόμαλλον and ἀγχιάλοιο with their dactylic ring. These lines confirm the impression of the preceding prologue, in which Hypsipyle, after invoking Dionysus (see above, Section 5), tells not only her personal history, but also about the expedition of the Argonauts (fr. 752a.10, 752b.5). And at the end of the prologue, when Euneus and Thoas have entered the house, she sings to her nursling Opheltes "not the Lemnian songs, relieving the labor of weft-thread and web-stretching shuttle, that the Muse desires me to sing" (fr. 752 f.9–11), an excellent *praeteritio* stressing that normally Hypsipyle sings epic poetry. Note that the weaving metaphor is also present in Euripides already: as Carole Newlands has recently suggested, "[w]ith the metaphor of weaving deployed by Hypsipyle [in *Theb*. 5.36], Statius acknowledges his debt to his tragic model as well as to Valerius,"[65] while at the same time the weaving metaphor connects Hypsipyle's narrative with Bacchus' delay of the Argive expedition (4.677).

In the following fragment (fr. 752g), Hypsipyle is indeed singing of the Argonauts; she is not interested in the approaching Argives, to which the chorus want her to turn attention. In the first lines of fr. 752h, immediately before the entrance of Amphiaraus, Hypsipyle again mentions her Muse, Calliope, as an epic poet might do (fr. 752h.5–9). In short, Euripides portrays

---

64 Cf. *Theb*. 5.499, 615–616, 658.
65 Newlands (2012) 42.

Hypsipyle not merely as a poet figure, but as an epic poet figure, singing time and time again of Lemnos and the Argonauts.

When Statius makes Hypsipyle an epic poet, who takes control of the narrative for some 450 hexameters with the narration of the Lemnian massacre and the Argonauts' visit to Lemnos (5.49–499), he is capitalizing on the epic potential of his tragic heroine: in Euripides' tragedy, Hypsipyle's epic voice is stifled by the limitations of the tragic genre, but in Statius' epic poem her epic voice can speak freely.

8. *Epic Tradition and Dramatic πρᾶξις*

"What is common in varying narrations of a myth," Vessey writes, "is unlikely to be of great interest, but when an author decides to innovate and to use a version divergent from all or most other accounts, it may well be worth considering what factors led him to do so."[66] With that in mind, I now turn to the differences between Statius and Euripides. It is my hope to show that Statius in several instances rejects Euripides in favor of the old epic tradition.

(1) In Euripides' *Hypsipyle*, Amphiaraus is searching for sacrificial water, whereas the Seven need water to quench their thirst in Statius. The difference is easily explained from the Nemean drought, which Bacchus has caused in order to delay the expedition of the Seven against Thebes. The drought, however, as Reussner and Aricò have rightly pointed out, is no Statian invention. It is mentioned in two Pindaric *hypotheseis*.[67] Perhaps the drought already played a role in the Cyclic *Thebaid*; that, at least, is one possible explanation for the word πολυδίψιον ("thirsty") in its opening line.[68] In any case, it must be an old element of the epic tradition, also included in Antimachus' *Thebaid*.

(2) Another important difference is the role of Amphiaraus. In Euripides, he is one of the protagonists, but, in Statius' Nemean episode, he plays a

[66] Vessey (1973) 68–69.

[67] See Bond (1963) 148 and Aricò (1961) 57.

[68] Vessey (1970) 48 with n. 49; Brown (1994) 62. But according to Strabo (8.6.7) πολυδίψιον means πολυπόθητον ("much-desired"); others see an allusion to the Danaids. Marinatos suggests "abounding in Dipsioi-daemons," after Mycenaean *di-pi-si-jo*[*-i*]; see Bernabé (1996) 20–21 and Wathelet (1992) 103–104.

minor role.[69] At first sight, it seems that Statius has redistributed the actions of Euripides' Amphiaraus among the Argive heroes. In the first place, it is Adrastus, not Amphiaraus, who addresses Hypsipyle (Stat. *Theb.* 4.752–771): Aricò points out that, since the Seven are not looking for fresh water to make a sacrifice, but for water to quench their thirst, it is natural that not their priest, but their chief commander addresses Hypsipyle.[70] Secondly, it is Hippomedon and Capaneus, not Amphiaraus, who kill the serpent (5.556–578): since the serpent is sacred to Jupiter—yet another Statian innovation—the pious Amphiaraus is not the best candidate to kill a Jovian creature, whereas it suits Capaneus to assault Jupiter,[71] even indirectly and unknowingly, in a scene that foreshadows his assault on Jupiter in the finale of book 10. Thirdly, the Seven collectively defend Hypsipyle against the rage of Opheltes' bereaved parents (5.661–667): they are all in Hypsipyle's debt, since she has led them to Langia. Finally, as we have seen already, Amphiaraus' *consolatio* to Eurydice has been replaced with Adrastus' *consolatio* to Opheltes' father Lycurgus in book 6. Of course Statius' Amphiaraus' role remains crucial in that he interprets Opheltes' death as an ill omen and orders funeral games to be held in his honor, but otherwise he does not play a significant role in the Nemean episode.

Does Statius simply diverge from his Euripidean model? Or does he favor the epic tradition—the Cyclic or Antimachean *Thebaid*—over Euripides? In the absence of earlier epic versions,[72] the question is difficult to answer, but there is some evidence. We have an Apulian red-figure volute crater from Ruvo (ca. 340 BCE) depicting the Nemean serpent being slain by three heroes, with sword, spear, and stone.[73] Clearly the painting is not inspired by Euripides, where Amphiaraus kills the serpent with his arrows (Eur. *Hyps.* fr. 757.106–107). If the painting is related to the lost Greek epics, we may conjecture that in the traditional version the serpent was also killed by more than one hero. This impression is reinforced by Apollodorus (3.64) and Hyginus (*Fab.* 74), who also attribute the killing of the Nemean serpent to the Seven collectively, not to one particular hero. Hence Aricò rightly claims that Statius does not so much deviate from Euripides but rather sticks to the traditional version of the myth.[74] Statius has not redistributed the actions of

69 Brown (1994) 67 notices the difference.
70 Aricò (1961) 59. Cf. Reussner (1921) 42.
71 Aricò (1961) 58 with n. 14.
72 For the Cyclic *Thebaid*, see Bernabé (1996); for Antimachus, see Matthews (1996).
73 See Cockle (1987) 167 with plate 1.11; Pache (2004) 118–120 with fig. 21.
74 Aricò (1961) 58.

Euripides' Amphiaraus among the Seven; Euripides has allotted the actions of the Seven to Amphiaraus alone. In Euripides, it is the seer who asks for water, kills the serpent, defends Hypsipyle, consoles Opheltes' parents, and interprets the child's death. The reason is obvious: the number of *dramatis personae* in Attic tragedy is limited.

(3) In Euripides' play, Hypsipyle takes her nursling with her when she guides Amphiaraus to the spring, where the child is killed by the serpent. In Statius, by contrast, Hypsipyle places Opheltes on the ground "lest she be too slow a guide" (*Theb.* 4.785–786). Again Statius follows the epic tradition.[75] It is not difficult to explain Euripides' innovation vis-à-vis the epic tradition: Opheltes simply had to die off-stage.

(4) I would like to conclude with the finest example of Statius' creative engagement with Euripides, where Statius not only plays off his Euripidean model against the epic tradition but also toys with the expectations of his audience.

When Euripides' Eurydice hears that her son Opheltes is dead, she calls for vengeance. The play has a long *agon* scene in which Eurydice accuses Hypsipyle of intentionally killing Opheltes, while Hypsipyle pleads not guilty (Eur. *Hyps.* fr. 754b.2–3, 757 *passim*). Opheltes' father, Lycurgus, seems to be absent throughout the play, although we cannot completely exclude the possibility that he appeared towards the end.[76]

In Statius, by contrast, when Hypsipyle appears with the mangled remains of Opheltes, it is not Eurydice, but Opheltes' father Lycurgus who seeks vengeance. He enters the scene and, mad with grief, almost kills Hypsipyle, who is defended by Tydeus, Capaneus, Hippomedon, and Parthenopaeus (*Theb.* 5.650–666). When Lycurgus is threatened by the Seven, a group of Nemean peasants (and Euneus and Thoas, as we have seen above) rally to support their king (5.666–667). Adrastus and Amphiaraus arrive just in time to separate the two parties and prevent bloodshed (5.667–690).[77]

---

75 See Apollod. 3.64, where Hypsipyle also places the child on the ground before guiding the soldiers to the spring.

76 Eur. *Hyps.* fr. 752d.10 (Hypsipyle speaking): ἀδέσ]ποτος μ[ὲν ο]ἶκ[ο]ς ἀρσένων κυ[ρε]ῖ ("the house happens to be without a male ruler"). The preceding lines make clear that the line does not refer to Lemnos. Cockle (1987) 40 and 141 thinks that Lycurgus' appearance "is almost certainly necessary for the action of the play."

77 Cf. Brown (1994) 76.

For a moment, however, Statius creates the impression that he will follow Euripides; he plays with the intertextual expectations of his audience, as he does elsewhere.[78] Let us have a look at the beginning of the passage:

> ecce (fides superum!) laceras comitata Thoantis
> aduehit exsequias, contra subit obuia mater,
> femineos coetus plangentiaque agmina ducens.
> at non magnanimo pietas ignaua Lycurgo:
> fortior ille malis, lacrimasque insana resorbet
> ira patris … (*Theb.* 5.650–655)

> See! The gods do not deceive. Thoas' daughter comes, bringing with her the mangled remains. To meet her the mother advances leading a gathering of women, a mourning host. But great-hearted Lycurgus' love for his son is up and doing. He takes strength from calamity; a father's furious anger sucks back his tears …

We are invited to visualize (*ecce*) Hypsipyle, Thoas' daughter, carrying the mangled corpse of Opheltes. From the opposite direction (*contra*, *obuia*) comes Eurydice, accompanied by mourning women, reminiscent of Euripides' chorus of Nemean women. The situation, then, is exactly the same as in Euripides' *Hypsipyle*. Naturally, we expect Statius to follow his dramatic model, and we expect mother and nurse to re-enact their Euripidean *agon* scene. But at that moment, unexpectedly, Lycurgus makes his appearance. Eurydice recedes into the background, her emotional reaction postponed to the following book (6.135–192).[79] The words with which Statius introduces Lycurgus are noteworthy: *at non pietas magnanimo ignaua Lycurgo*. It is tempting to read these words as an intertextual comment on Euripides' Lycurgus, as if Statius were asking: "why did you not show your *pietas* towards your son in Euripides' *Hypsipyle*?" The answer to that question, perhaps, is in the word *magnanimo*, epic epithet par excellence,[80] which

---

78 Cf. Johnson (1994) 34–35 on the *Achilleid*: "The expectations of this audience (whom we must learn to resemble temporarily if we want to enjoy this poem) are that they will be deliciously frustrated and brilliantly baffled in what they do expect, that they will never get exactly what they want because they will be given much more than they knew they wanted … every new new scene [will] have its own *coup de théâtre* … Not only will every narrative sequence have its own unexpectedness, but also every verse will have its surprise." A fine example in the *Thebaid* is the beginning of Hypsipyle's narrative: in light of the intertextual models—Odysseus' encounter with Nausicaa and Aeneas' with Dido—one might expect the traveling hero to narrate his adventures; instead, it is the female benefactress who takes control of the narrative; see Ganiban (2007) 72.

79 Similarly Brown (1994) 79–80.

80 Formed after Homeric μεγάθυμος and μεγαλήτωρ, it occurs already, (in)famously, in Catul. 58.5. The epithet occurs frequently in the *Thebaid* (eighteen times), as it does in the

characterizes Lycurgus as epic hero. In Euripides' drama, there may be no place for him, but he takes control in Statius' epic. His immediate reaction, to avenge his son and kill Hypsipyle, comes close to what Kenneth Quinn has called the "heroic impulse."[81]

At first sight, one might think that Statius has simply "epicised" his Euripidean model. Reussner already noted the difference, explaining it in terms of genre: a violent confrontation between two armies is appropriate in epic, whereas at the theater it would not even be possible to stage such a scene.[82] Similarly Brown observes, "Statius replaces the dramatic debate between mother and nurse with the confrontation of epic warriors. Lycurgus threatens Hypsipyle with all the fury of an epic warrior in combat."[83] Another factor, I would like to add, is that Statius' Hypsipyle, unlike her Euripidean predecessor, immediately accepts the responsibility for Opheltes' death and even wishes to be killed (5.620–637),[84] which precludes an *agon* about the question of guilt, as in Euripides.

Aricò has argued that the scene is no Statian invention: the confrontation between the Seven and Lycurgus, he suggests, looks back to the old epic tradition. He bases his idea on the mythographer Hyginus, who writes that *Adrastus et ceteri … Lycum* [sc. Lycurgum] *pro Hypsipyle deprecati sunt* ("Adrastus and the rest entreat Lycus (Lycurgus) on Hypsipyle's behalf," Hyg. *Fab*. 74).[85] Aricò's suggestion, I would like to point out, is supported by visual evidence. In Olympia an archaic bronze shield band (datable to 575–550 BCE) has been found, which depicts a confrontation between two warriors armed with helmets, shields, and swords; they are flanked by more warriors, who attempt to restrain them; between the two protagonists stands a man intervening.[86] On the shield three names are inscribed: the central figure is Adrastus; the name of the man on the left is probably Amphiaraus; the

---

Aeneid (twelve times). Statius applies it to numerous warriors, e.g., Tydeus, Capaneus and Menoeceus, and notably to Domitian in *Theb*. 12.814. See Dewar (1991) 161 and Dominik (1994) 31 with n. 44.

81 Quinn (1968) 1–22.

82 Reussner (1921) 42.

83 Brown (1994) 77.

84 Whereas Statius' Hypsipyle supplicates the Seven in the hope of being killed, Euripides' Hypsipyle supplicates Amphiaraus in the hope of *not* being killed (Eur. *Hyps*. fr. 757.57–62). Like her Euripidean predecessor, Statius' Hypsipyle supports her plea with reference to the favor (χάρις) she has bestowed upon the Seven (*Hyps*. fr. 757.60; cf. *gratia* at *Theb*. 5.629)—an allusion that highlights the difference.

85 Aricò (1961) 58.

86 See Simon (1979) 31–33 and Pache (2004) 129 with fig. 32 and 33.

name of the man on the right is difficult to read, but probably Lycurgus.[87] Thanks to these names, there can be no doubt that the scene depicts Adrastus intervening in a quarrel between Amphiaraus and Lycurgus. This shield band is most important for our evaluation of Statius and Euripides, for it shows that Statius has not invented the violent confrontation between the Seven and Lycurgus (Stat. *Theb.* 5.650–690) himself. I do not mean to suggest that Statius looks back directly to the shield band, but the visual evidence shows that the quarrel between the Seven and Lycurgus, as well as the intervention of Adrastus, are old elements of the story, perhaps already included in the Cyclic *Thebaid*. That is confirmed by Pausanias, who informs us that almost the exact same scene was also depicted on the ancient throne at Amyclae: Ἄδραστος δὲ καὶ Τυδεὺς Ἀμφιάραον καὶ Λυκοῦργον τὸν Πρώνακτος μάχης καταπαύουσιν ("Adrastus and Tydeus are staying the fight between Amphiaraus and Lycurgus the son of Pronax," Paus. 3.18.12). Moreover, there is a Laconian cup that shows Parthenopaeus amongst those that attempt to separate the two combatants.[88]

Of course there are also differences with Statius. His Amphiaraus does not fight but intervenes, for instance, while Tydeus and Parthenopaeus do not intervene but fight. Probably that has to do with Statius' characterization of Amphiaraus as a peaceful seer and of Tydeus as a hot-headed warrior. Another important difference is that the shield band and the throne at Amyclae do not depict Hypsipyle, which supports the *communis opinio* that her involvement in Opheltes' death is indeed a Euripidean innovation. Yet essentially the scene on the shield strap and the scene in Statius' *Thebaid* are identical, which strongly suggests that in this particular scene Statius has rejected the Euripidean scenario—which lines 5.650–652 suggest he would follow—in favor of the epic tradition.[89]

---

87 On the left we read [A]mph[i]ar[e]o[s]; on the right we read …]korgos (?); see Simon (1979) 31 with n. 5 and fig. 1.

88 See Simon (1979) 32 with references.

89 On Statius' possible engagement with the Cyclic *Thebaid*, see also Hulls in this volume, pp. 199–201.

GREEK AUTHOR, GREEK PAST: STATIUS, ATHENS, AND THE TRAGIC SELF[*]

Jean-Michel Hulls

This paper constitutes an attempt to pull together several strands of Statius' poetic identity. In particular it will focus on certain aspects of his relationship as a poet to classical Greek literature. Although this may sound a simple exercise, there are a number of complicating factors. To begin with, Statius' intertextual relationships with Greek literature are refracted through a first century Roman lens. Those texts closest to Statius' poetry in the chronological sense tend to shout loudest when we read that poetry. Moreover, his Latin poetry inevitably tends to privilege intertextual readings of other Latin texts. However we read Statius' relationship to his Greek past, this will always be a reading between the lines.

Beyond the simple mechanics of allusion, the process is further complicated by Statius' sense of identity, upon which I would like to focus here.[1] Statius was a Latin poet writing at the forefront of a Roman cultural renaissance. He was also a poet of relatively humble origins, born to a Greek *grammaticus* in an Italian city with a highly developed sense of its own Greek past. Such tensions are borne out in the work on which we shall focus most closely, the *Thebaid*, an unashamedly Roman epic poem in the Virgilian tradition with a surprisingly Greek subject. Indeed, where Statius' epic competitors use their poetry (and a prophesying Jupiter) to point towards future Roman dominion, the *Thebaid* is avowedly divorced in attention from Flavian Rome.[2] As we shall see, Statius does not simply ignore his Greek literary inheritance, rather he embraces this Hellenic aspect of his poetic identity and does so in a very Roman way.

[*] My thanks to Antony Augoustakis for inviting me to give a version of this paper in Delphi and to the delegates of that conference for their intelligent comments and queries which did much to improve its content. Any errors and infelicities of course remain my own.

[1] On this topic, see Newlands (2012) 136–159.

[2] Cf. the explicit *recusatio* at Stat. *Theb.* 1.15–33.

In what follows, we begin by exploring Statius' self-presentation in two poems of the *Siluae*, specifically the ways in which he aggressively asserts his own *Romanitas*, his attitude towards Greek poetry, and his awkward positioning in relation to his own Greek past. With this framework established, we shall look at one extreme possibility for reading Greek texts in Statian poetry, before moving on to sketch ways in which Statius invokes Greek tragic texts in his poem while maintaining his sense of dominance over Greek culture.[3]

1. *Statian Identities: Greek and Roman in the* Siluae

We know, largely from snippets of the *Siluae*, that Statius was born in Naples (Stat. *Silu.* 3.5.12–13; 4.7.17–20), that his father was a teacher of Greek poetry, at first in Campania, later in Rome (5.3.146–177), and that he himself competed in poetry competitions in Greece and Italy (5.3.133–145). This makes for a rich and interesting Greco-Italian background from which to construct one's identity. Yet this is not the impression one gets from reading other elements of the poet's *persona*. We can begin with a moment of Statian self-presentation in *Siluae* 4.7, a poem perhaps best known for its confident assertion of the *Thebaid*'s success in comparison to the *Aeneid* (25–28), and whose seventh stanza is often quoted in comparison to the more diffident *sphragis* of the *Thebaid* itself.[4] More importantly for our purposes, however, the poem also asserts its own metrical and generic mastery over Augustan and Greek predecessors:

> iam diu lato sociata campo
> fortis heroos, Erato, labores
> differ atque ingens opus in minores
>   contrahe gyros,
> tuque regnator lyricae cohortis
> da noui paulum mihi iura plectri,
> *si tuas cantu Latio sacraui,*
>   *Pindare, Thebas.*
> Maximo carmen tenuare tempto;[5]

---

[3] On the connections between Statius' poetry and Athenian tragedy in particular, see Holford-Strevens (2000), Heslin (2008), Bessone (2011), and Soerink in this volume, pp. 171–191.

[4] On the structure and content of this poem, see Rühl (2006) 223–225.

[5] There are many puns in this poem: *maximo carmen tenuare tempto* is a typically lyric, Callimachean play on scale. There is comic potential in the notion of swift-footed Achilles stuck at the first turn of a chariot race, and I wonder if *metis* may evoke the Greek word for "craft" or "plan," suggesting his epic is stuck at the planning phase.

> nunc ab intonsa capienda myrto
> serta, nunc †maior† sitis et bibendus
> castior amnis. (Stat. *Silu.* 4.7.1–12)

> Long, valiant Erato, have you ranged the spreading plain; now defer heroic labors and narrow your mighty work into lesser circuits; and you, *Pindar*, ruler of the lyric band, grant me for a little while the right to change my quill, *if I have hallowed your Thebes with Latian song*: for Maximus I essay to trim my verse. Now my garlands must be taken from unpruned myrtle, now my thirst is livelier (?) but I have to drink of a purer river.

This is a poem in sapphics in a collection which flaunts experimentation as nowhere else in Statius' oeuvre, as Federica Bessone discusses in this volume.[6] We can compare this to the other odd-numbered compositions in book 4, which include two hendecasyllabic poems (4.3 and 4.9) and another one in alcaics (4.5). Statius' use of the sapphic meter inevitably sets up a rivalry with the most famous Roman practitioners of that meter, Catullus and Horace.[7] Yet this is also an appropriation of the poetics of Sappho herself. Sappho, here represented in metrical form, was an erotic poet first and foremost. Moreover, the myrtle which Statius weaves is symbolic of Venus. The torpor which Sappho felt in her most famous fragment as a result of love (fr. 31, "translated" in Catullus 51) is transformed into writer's block. Statius in typical fashion re-orients Sapphic poetry towards the subject of composition (of epic in particular) and his non-erotic relationship with Vibius Maximus, who here plays a quasi-divine role as (potential) inspiration for Statius' various poetic projects. The poem also incorporates glances back to the poet's completed project, the *Thebaid*, not only in the seventh stanza, but also in the second. Here we see the hybridity in Statius' self-definition: the lyric ode to Maximus is itself a very Roman, Flavian poem in Greek form; the reverse is true of the *Thebaid* which he describes as Thebes sanctified with Latian song (4.7.7–8). Although in both instances there is a clear marriage between Greek and Latin in terms of both form and content, there is a clear sense of Roman dominance in all of this:

> ecce me natum propiore terra
> non tamen portu retinent amoeno
> desides Baiae liticenue notus
> Hectoris armis.

6 See esp. pp. 221–223.
7 See Morgan (2010) 189–199. Cf. also Coleman (1988) 195–198.

torpor est nostris sine te Camenis,
tardius sueto uenit ipse Thymbrae
rector et primis meus ecce metis
haeret Achilles. (Stat. *Silu.* 4.7.17–24)

As for me, born though I was in a less distant land, yet lazy Baiae does not hold me in her pleasant haven nor the trumpeter known to Hector's arms. My Muse is in torpor without you. Thymbra's ruler himself comes more slowly than is his wont and, see, my Achilles is stuck at the first turning point.

Despite his early reverence to Pindar (*regnator lyricae cohortis*, 4.7.5), Statius is not restrained by his Greek upbringing, either by remaining physically in the bay of Naples, or in poetic terms. The allusive reference to Misenus blends the geographical (the bay of Naples again) with a literary character.[8] Moreover, his poetic relationship with Apollo, here identified by his Troadic epithet, seems anything but deferential. Statius casts himself as a poet of Latium (cf. *cantu Latio*, 4.7.7), one comfortably in control of a wide variety of Greek poetic modes.

This Romano-centric mode of self-presentation continues in the *epicedion* to his late father, *Siluae* 5.3.[9] This rich and complex poem construes the father as the virtuoso of Greek modes of poetry, but the son as a master of Roman poetry. Early in the piece, Statius imagines two possible afterlives for his father:

at tu, seu membris emissus in ardua tendens
fulgentesque plagas rerumque elementa recenses,
quis deus, unde ignes, quae ducat semita solem,
quae minuat Phoeben quaeque integrare latentem
causa queat, notique modos extendis Arati;
seu tu Lethaei secreto in gramine campi
concilia heroum iuxta manesque beatos,
Maeonium Ascraeumque senem non segnior umbra
accolis alternumque sonas et carmina misces:
da uocem magno, pater, ingenium⟨que⟩ dolori. (Stat. *Silu.* 5.3.19–28)

Discharged from your body and soaring to the heights, do you review the shining regions and Nature's elements—what is God, whence comes fire, what pathway leads the sun, what cause dominates Phoebe and what can

[8] Misenus features in *Aeneid* 6, but is also in another tradition a companion of Odysseus; see Coleman (1988) 202. The unusual Greek noun, *liticen*, in a Greek accusative form, also suggests that Misenus' status as trumpet-player gives him a bardic quality. Statius may be asserting control over singers of *Iliad*s as much as *Aeneid*s. For the privileging of the Virgilian tradition, see Gibson (2006) 330.

[9] In general on this poem, see Gibson (2006) 260–266 and Rühl (2006) 362–367.

> renew her when she hides?—continuing the music of famed Aratus? Or in the secluded herbage of Lethe's meadow, among gatherings of heroes and blessed ghosts do you keep company with the old Maeonian or him of Ascra, yourself no less busy a shade, making music in turn, mingling song? Wherever you are, my father, give voice and skill to my great grief.

Statius imagines his father's shade either ascending into the heavens or descending to Elysium. Either way, the father displays his exceptional prowess as an epic poet; in the first case, he will exceed the successes of Aratus; if the latter possibility comes to pass, he will be the equal of Homer and Hesiod. In either event, Statius implores his father to become an inspirational deity for his own epic lament. Later in the poem, during an extended eulogy of his father and in particular for his role as a teacher of poetry, Statius emphasizes the range of Greek poetic modes that his father had mastered:

> hinc tibi uota patrum credi generosaque pubes
> te monitore regi, mores et facta priorum
> discere, quis casus Troiae, quam tardus Vlixes,
> quantus equum pugnasque uirum decurrere uersu
> Maeonides quantumque pios ditarit agrestes
> Ascraeus Siculusque senex, qua lege recurrat
> Pindaricae uox flexa lyrae uolucrumque precator
> Ibycus et tetricis Alcman cantatus Amyclis
> Stesichorusque ferox saltusque ingressa uiriles
> non formidata temeraria Chalcide Sappho,
> quosque alios dignata chelys. tu pandere doctus
> carmina Battiadae latebrasque Lycophronis atri
> Sophronaque implicitum tenuisque arcana Corinnae.
> sed quid parua loquor? tu par assuetus Homero
> ferre iugum senosque pedes aequare solutis
> uersibus et numquam passu breuiore relinqui. (Stat. *Silu.* 5.3.146–161)

> Hence parents' hopes were entrusted to you and noble youth governed by your guidance, as they learned the manners and deeds of men gone by: the tale of Troy, Ulysses' tardiness, Maeonides' power to pass in verse through heroes' horses and combats, what riches the old man of Ascra and the old man of Sicily gave honest farmers, what law governs the recurring voice of Pindar's winding harp, and Ibycus, who prayed to birds, and Stesichorus and rash Sappho, who feared not Leucas but took the manly leap, and others by the lyre approved. You were skilled to expound the songs of Battus' son, the lurking places of dark Lycophron, Sophron's mazes, and the secrets of subtle Corinna. But why speak of trifles? You were wont to bear equal yoke with Homer, matching his six feet with verse turned to prose, never outpaced and left behind.

Again, Statius emphasizes his father's poetic excellence particularly by reference to Homeric epic, but also accentuates his range of ability with the

"curriculum" of more recherché Greek lyric poets and the variety of literary knowledge he possessed.[10] It is interesting to note the stress on metrical control which Statius also displayed in 4.7. Two very notable things about Statius' eulogy of his *pater-grammaticus* is that all the poets mentioned are Greek and that the curriculum that Statius outlines suggests that first century CE Greco-Romans may have had a broader understanding of what constitutes "classical" Greek poetry than we do. While the father's *persona* is emphatically Greek and steeped in Greek literature, Statius himself, much as he does in 4.7, portrays himself as a Roman and specifically Latian poet. There is a strong epic quality to his poetic identity, but there is a deliberate contrast between the father's Homeric legacy and Statius' Virgilian inheritance:

> certe ego, magnanimum qui facta attollere regum
> ibam altum spirans Martemque aequare canendo …
> uix haec in munera soluo
> primum animum tacitisque situm depellere chordis
> nunc etiam labente manu nec lumine sicco
> ordior adclinis tumulo quo molle quiescis
> iugera nostra tenens, ubi post Aeneia fata
> stellatus Latiis ingessit montibus Albam
> Ascanius, Phrygio dum pingues sanguine campos
> odit et infaustae regnum dotale nouercae. (Stat. *Silu.* 5.3.10–11, 33–40)

> For sure, I am he whose lofty inspiration would exalt the deeds of great-souled kings and match their warfare in their lay … Hardly do I relax my mind for the first time to do this office and start to brush away this dust from my silent strings with hand still faltering and eyes not dry, leaning upon the tomb in which you softly rest in your own acres, where after Aeneas' death starred Ascanius piled Alba on the Latian hills, hating the fields soaked with Phrygian blood and the dotal kingdom of an inauspicious stepmother.

Statius again locates himself in (Virgilian) Latium and constructs a connection between his own mourning of his father and Ascanius (implicitly) mourning Aeneas. The opening passages of 5.3 draw a rather stark contrast between the Greek poetics of the father and the Latin poetics of the son. The connection between the two is not fully acknowledged by Statius until he has completed more than two-thirds of his *epicedion*:

---

[10] See Gibson (2006) 321; the categories are plot, effect, meter, and exegesis. On the excellence of Statius' father as a poet and the peculiar Greek curriculum, see also Holford-Strevens (2000); McNelis (2002); and Newlands (2012) 88–90, 93–95.

> me quoque uocales lucos Boeotaque tempe
> pulsantem, cum stirpe tua descendere dixi,
> admisere deae; nec enim mihi sidera tantum
> aequoraque et terras, quae mos debere parenti,
> sed decus hoc quodcumque lyrae primusque dedisti
> non uulgare loqui et famam sperare sepulchro.
> qualis eras, Latios quotiens ego carmine patres
> mulcerem … (Stat. *Silu.* 5.3.209–216)

> Me too, as I knocked at the vocal groves and Boeotia's vales, claiming myself sprung from your stock, did the goddesses admit. For not only stars and sea and land, the common debt of son to parent, but this grace of the lyre, whatever it be, you were the first to give me: speech beyond the vulgar, hope of fame in the grave. What was your mien whenever I soothed the Latian Fathers with my song …

Here at last we see the explicit link between the father and son, between teacher and pupil.[11] The curriculum of (often rather obscure) Greek poetry that Statius had outlined earlier in the poem was one that he himself followed, but both 4.7 and 5.3 suggest that Statius read his Greek poetry with a Latinist's eye. We should not, therefore, be surprised to find that when Statius makes intertextual links with his Greek poetic inheritance (and I would emphasize that this inheritance has an immediacy for Statius in many ways), that he does so in ways which we might describe as "Romanizing." What is more arresting is the stark polarization between the categories of "Greek" and "Roman" in the consideration of literature; the reality is, of course, far more complex than Statius would have us believe.

2. *How Far Can You Go? The Cyclic* Thebaid *and the Extremities of Influence*

This poetic stance might seem to be a little negative. Indeed, readers of Statius' *Thebaid* will be surprised to see how an author with such a wealth of intertextual affiliations can seem to privilege Hellenistic poetics and ostensibly eschew obvious classical Greek influences. The relentless, almost overdetermined focus on Neronian, Augustan, and Hellenistic texts suggests that Statius is perhaps trying to be "more Roman than the Romans." There are intertextual traces of older Greek texts in Statius' *Thebaid*, nonetheless, and there is much value in attempting relatively provocative readings here. Early

---

11 On this relationship, see Newlands (2012) 88–90. Cf. also Rühl (2006) 364–365.

in the first book of the poem, Statius tells us that Thebes is not a kingdom worth fighting for. Instead, the brothers are fighting for power pure and simple (*sed* nuda potestas / *armauit fratres, pugna est de* paupere regno, "but *naked power* armed the brethren, their fight is for a *pauper crown*," Stat. *Theb.* 1.150–151). It is a striking point to make, yet one which is not much elaborated upon in the rest of the poem. Instead, allusion may be the key to understanding this. Two fragments of the Cyclic *Thebaid* survive explaining why Oedipus cursed his sons:

> αὐτὰρ ὁ διογενὴς ἥρως ξανθὸς Πολυνείκης
> πρῶτα μὲν Οἰδιπόδηι καλὴν παρέθηκε τράπεζαν
> ἀργυρέην Κάδμοιο θεόφρονος· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
> χρύσεον ἔμπλησεν καλὸν δέπας ἡδέος οἴνου.
> αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ὡς φράσθη παρακείμενα πατρὸς ἑοῖο
> τιμήεντα γέρα, μέγα οἱ κακὸν ἔμπεσε θυμῶι,
> αἶψα δὲ παισὶν ἑοῖσι μετ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἐπαράς
> ἀργαλέας ἠρᾶτο, θεὰν δ' οὐ λάνθαν' Ἐρινύν,
> ὡς οὔ οἱ πατρώϊ' ἐνηέϊ ⟨ἐν⟩ φιλότητι
> δάσσαιντ', ἀμφοτέροισι δ' ἀεὶ πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε … (*Thebais* fr. 2 West)
>
> But the highborn hero, flaxen-haired Polynices, firstly set beside Oedipus the fine silver table of godly Cadmus; then he filled his fine gold cup with sweet wine. But when he became aware that his father's precious treasures had been set beside him, some great evil invaded his heart, and at once he laid dreadful curses upon both his sons, which the divine Erinys did not fail to note: that they should not divide their patrimony in friendship, but the two of them ever in battle and strife …
>
> ἰσχίον ὡς ἐνόησε χαμαὶ βάλεν εἶπέ τε μῦθον·
> 'ὤι μοι ἐγώ, παῖδες μὲν ὀνειδείοντες ἔπεμψαν …'
> εὖκτο Διὶ βασιλῆϊ καὶ ἄλλοις ἀθανάτοισιν,
> χερσὶν ὑπ' ἀλλήλων καταβήμεναι Ἄϊδος εἴσω. (*Thebais* fr. 3 West)
>
> When he realized it was a haunch, he threw it to the ground and said: "Oh my sons have insultingly sent …" … He prayed to Zeus the king and to the other immortals that they should go down into Hades' house at each other's hands.

Ruth Parkes, the latest commentator of Statius' poem, states that "Statian use of the Cyclic *Thebaid* remains unclear due to the paucity of evidence"[12] and, indeed, Statius bases the Oedipal curse on the Euripidean narrative and

---

[12] Parkes (2012) xxix and 281–282: "it would seem that a drought was part of the Argive-Theban story but little can be built on one reference to *Argos … poludipsion*." Vessey dismisses the possibility of allusion to the cyclic *Thebaid*; see (1970) 118 n. 1 and (1973) 69. Lesueur (1990) xii enthusiastically encourages such readings. Cf. Soerink in this volume, pp. 186–187.

not on offences caused during scenes of feasting. Yet when Statius returns to the cause of the conflict a little later in the first book, the details he evokes in demonstrating that Thebes is not a rich kingdom certainly strikes a chord with a reader familiar with the Cyclic fragments. The poet illustrates the nature of Thebes by informing the audience that it lacks wealth, specifically gold, marble and jewels:[13]

> et nondum *crasso laquearia fulua metallo*,
> montibus aut alte Grais effulta nitebant
> atria, congestos satis explicitura clientes;
> non impacatis regum aduigilantia somnis
> pila, nec alterna ferri statione gementes
> excubiae, nec cura *mero committere gemmas*
> atque *aurum uiolare cibis*: sed nuda potestas
> armauit fratres … (Stat. *Theb.* 1.144–151)

> And not yet did *paneled ceilings shine fulvous with thick metal* or lofty halls propped on Greek marble, with space to spread the assembled clients. There were no spears watching over the restless slumbers of monarchs nor sentinels who groaned at the recurring duty of the sword, nor were they at pains *to trust jewels to wine and pollute gold with victuals*: naked power armed the brethren …

Most commentators focus on the end of this passage. *Nuda potestas* motivates the conflict. It is interesting, however, to note the possibilities for conflict against which *nuda potestas* is opposed: Statius' Thebes lacks the very things that normally motivate conflict; this absence is expressed in terms which may key the alert reader into realizing that Statius makes more than a point of political theory. The phrase *mero committere gemmas* is at least suggestive of the cup of Laius in the Cyclic fragment, while the striking use of *uiolare* in the phrase *aurum uiolare cibis* may conflate ideas from both fragments. It is difficult to assert such an allusion with anything approaching certainty, but certainty is not something which one should expect of Statius. Such an allusion would always be palimpsestic in character; this hint at the literary past only adds to the rich texture of the poem. Statius is a "Romanizer" of the Greek literary past and any invocation only serves to reinforce the Latinity of Statius' epic production.

---

13 The passage evokes Sen. *Thy.* 446–470 where Thyestes praises his simple and humble life in contrast to the fearful state of the autocratic ruler. Here Statius plays on the contrast; tyranny is rife *even* in this humble kingdom. Contrast also the conflict between Lucan's Caesar and Pompey, for whom the entire world's wealth is insufficient (Luc. 1.109–111), see Schiesaro (2003) 108–109. On Statius and Seneca, see Augoustakis (2014).

3. *Amalgamation and Reversal: Asserting Control of Greek Tragedy*

In a sense, it is not especially important whether we believe that the Cyclic *Thebaid* is lurking in the background or not, but the possibility that this depth of allusion may exist *is* and the mechanics of the intertextuality and the relationship with poetic identity are crucial to understanding the poet's interaction with Greek tragedy.[14] Let us follow this rather hesitant reading with two instances where the *Thebaid* is looking back to specific moments in Greek tragedy and where the activation of Greek tragic texts adds richness to the reading of this Roman epic.

Let us first examine the end of book 11, where Creon, freshly installed as king of Thebes after the deaths of Polynices and Eteocles, sends Oedipus into exile. The blind old man's reaction is remarkably aggressive and he displays a brief rejuvenation in the face of Creon's decree:[15]

> horruit instinctu rabido, steteruntque trementes
> ceu uisu praesente genae, *seniumque recessit*.
> tunc natam *baculumque manu dimisit*, et irae
> innixus tumido uocem de pectore rumpit … (Stat. *Theb*. 11.673–676)

> Oedipus started in mad excitement, his cheeks stood quivering as though he saw, *his old age fell away*. Then *he thrust aside his daughter and staff*; leaning upon his anger, he lets words burst forth from his swelling breast …

A long and sarcastic speech filled with rhetorical fireworks follows (11.677–707 contain no fewer than fourteen rhetorical questions!), and when Antigone entreats her uncle to change his mind (707–740), Oedipus is likened to an aging lion:

> qualis leo rupe sub alta,
> quem uiridem quondam siluae montesque tremebant,
> iam piger et *longo* iacet exarmatus *ab aeuo*,
> magna tamen facies et *non adeunda senectus*;
> et si demissas ueniat mugitus ad aures,
> erigitur *meminitque sui*, uiresque solutas
> ingemit et campis alios regnare leones. (Stat. *Theb*. 11.741–747)

> Like to a lion under a high crag, at whom in his prime forest and mountain once trembled; now he lies inactive, disarmed *by length of years*, yet his face is grand and *his old age best left alone*; and if a sound of lowing come to his

[14] It is also worth considering that Statius is not only a "Romanizer" of Greek tragedy, but is also continuing a dialogue with his Roman predecessors, Virgil and Seneca in particular, on how best to achieve such a Romanization.

[15] Cf. Bessone (2011) 56–57.

> drooping ears, he rises up *and remembers himself*, groaning for his strength decayed and that other lions bear lordship in the plains.

The emphasis on age and especially on rejuvenation is a familiar theme from an earlier confrontation between Creon and Oedipus in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*.[16] In this act (*OC* 720–1043), following a prophecy that Oedipus will support the winner in the fraternal conflict, Creon comes to Colonus initially to persuade Oedipus to return to Thebes but then kidnaps Ismene and Antigone in an attempt to blackmail him. Creon is only thwarted by the appearance of Theseus, who is much younger than either Theban; indeed the *agon* between Creon and Oedipus uses age as a persistent and pervasive theme:

> **ΚΡ.** ἄνδρες χθονὸς τῆσδ᾽ εὐγενεῖς οἰκήτορες,
> ὁρῶ τιν᾽ ὑμᾶς ὀμμάτων εἰληφότας
> φόβον νεώρη τῆς ἐμῆς ἐπεισόδου·
> ὃν μήτ᾽ ὀκνεῖτε μήτ᾽ ἀφῆτ᾽ ἔπος κακόν.
> ἥκω γὰρ οὐχ ὡς δρᾶν τι βουληθείς, *ἐπεὶ*
> *γέρων μέν εἰμι*, πρὸς πόλιν δ᾽ ἐπίσταμαι
> σθένουσαν ἥκων, εἴ τιν᾽ Ἑλλάδος, μέγα.
> ἀλλ᾽ ἄνδρα τόνδε *τηλικόσδ᾽* ἀπεστάλην
> πείσων ἕπεσθαι πρὸς τὸ Καδμείων πέδον,
> … πᾶς σε Καδμείων λεὼς
> καλεῖ δικαίως, ἐκ δὲ τῶν μάλιστ᾽ ἐγώ·
> [ὅσῳπερ, εἰ μὴ πλεῖστον ἀνθρώπων ἔφυν]
> μάλιστα δ᾽ ἀλγῶ τοῖσι σοῖς κακοῖς, *γέρον*,
> ὁρῶν σε τὸν δύστηνον ὄντα μὲν ξένον,
> ἀεὶ δ᾽ ἀλήτην κἀπὶ προσπόλου μιᾶς
> βιοστερῆ χωροῦντα … (Soph. *OC* 728–736, 741–747)

> Cr: Men who are the noble dwellers in this land, I see in your eyes a fear newly caused by my arrival! But do not be alarmed by it, nor let fall a hostile word! For I have not come intending any action, *since I am old*, and I know that I have come to a city that has great power, if any has in Greece. But I set out, *old as I am*, to persuade this man to accompany me to the land of the Cadmeans … The whole people of Cadmus summons you, with good reason, and I most of all [inasmuch as, if I am not the very worst of men, I] grieve at your sorrows, *aged man*, seeing that in your misery you are an exile, and ever wander in indigence with but one attendant.

> ΚΡ. ὦ δύσμορ᾽, οὐδὲ τῷ χρόνῳ φύσας φανῇ
> φρένας ποτ᾽ ἀλλὰ λῦμα τῷ γήρᾳ τρέφῃ; …
> οὔκουν ποτ᾽ ἐκ τούτοιν γε μὴ *σκήπτροιν* ἔτι
> ὁδοιπορήσῃς … (Soph. *OC* 804–805, 848–849)

---

[16] On the importance of this play for *Thebaid* 12, see Heslin (2008) 120–128.

Unhappy man, shall you never be seen to have acquired sense with years, but does your old age sustain you as a blight? … Then you shall never more walk with the aid of these two *props*!

ΟΙ. μὴ γὰρ αἵδε δαίμονες
θεῖέν μ᾽ ἄφωνον τῆσδε τῆς ἀρᾶς ἔτι,
ὅς γ᾽, ὦ *κάκιστε*, φίλιον ὄμμ᾽ ἀποσπάσας
πρὸς ὄμμασιν τοῖς πρόσθεν ἐξοίχῃ βίᾳ.
τοιγὰρ σέ *καὐτὸν καὶ* γένος τὸ σὸν θεῶν
ὁ πάντα λεύσσων Ἥλιος δοίη βίον
τοιοῦτον οἷον *κἀμὲ γηρᾶναί ποτε*.
ΚΡ. ὁρᾶτε ταῦτα, τῆσδε γῆς ἐγχώριοι;
ΟΙ. ὁρῶσι *κἀμὲ καὶ* σέ, *καὶ* φρονοῦσ᾽ ὅτι
ἔργοις πεπονθὼς ῥήμασίν σ᾽ ἀμύνομαι.
ΚΡ. *οὔτοι καθέξω θυμόν*, ἀλλ᾽ ἄξω βίᾳ
κεἰ μοῦνός εἰμι τόνδε *καὶ χρόνῳ βραδύς*. (Soph. *OC* 864–875)

Oed: No, may the goddesses here no longer check the curse that is on my lips, on you, you villain, who have snatched from me by violence the beloved eye I had, gone like the eyes I had already lost! Therefore may the all-seeing Sun grant that *your old age is like mine*!
Cr: Do you see this, natives of the land?
Oed: They see me and you, and they are aware that I have suffered in actions and defend myself against you only in words.
Cr: *I shall no longer restrain my anger*, but shall carry this man away, *even if I am alone* and *made slow by age*!

ΚΡ. πρὸς ταῦτα πράξεις οἷον ἂν θέλῃς· ἐπεὶ
ἐρημία με, *κεἰ* δίκαι᾽ ὅμως λέγω,
σμικρὸν τίθησι· πρὸς δὲ τὰς πράξεις ἔτι,
καὶ τηλικόσδ᾽ ὤν, ἀντιδρᾶν πειράσομαι. (Soph. *OC* 956–959)

In the face of that you may do what you will, since even if my plea is just, I am alone and powerless; but in response to what you do, *old as I am*, I shall one day attempt to act.

Throughout the scene, the age of the two Thebans is consistently emphasized to such an extent that the constant threats of actions and violence border on the comical after a while. The rapidity with which Theseus is able to thwart Creon's plan after his appearance at line 887 sets the whole *agon* in relief; the Athenian king is the genuinely youthful man of action. Yet Creon, even as he highlights his own old age, destabilizes that self-presentation by his reliance on impulsive action, his refusal to abandon his *thumos*, and his willingness to oppose Oedipus and Theseus until his death.

It seems that Statius picks up this theme from Sophocles in his presentation of Oedipus' exile in his own poem. Yet it is his Oedipus who takes

up the role that Creon plays in Sophocles. Latin Oedipus' shuddering and swelling breast mirrors Greek Creon's *thumos*, while the detail that the Latin Oedipus throws away his stick and leans on his anger neatly plays on Greek Creon's ironic reference to σκῆπτρα (*OC* 848–849). Statius carefully echoes the themes of the Sophoclean play. Yet there is a further point to Statius' imitation. What we get in the *Thebaid* is almost an exact reversal of the Sophoclean plot. In Sophocles, Creon comes to Athens in order to persuade the exiled Oedipus to return to Thebes. In Statius, Creon sends Oedipus into exile. In Sophocles, it is Creon who displays a surprising energy for someone who professes old age. In Statius, it is Oedipus who momentarily shrugs off his age in order to harangue Creon.[17] The suggestion is that this reversal is a reflection of Statius' desires to move away from his own Greekness, the reversal of the plot of Sophocles' play becoming symbolic of Statius assertion of his own control of this Theban narrative.

Similar processes of appropriation and redirection are visible in Statius' depiction of the suicide of Menoeceus in book 10 (628–825). This long episode in the *Thebaid* has its origins in Euripides' *Phoenissae* where it is a much less significant element in a complicated plot. Statius emphasizes the act of suicide itself in a way which Euripides' play does not. Indeed, in the *Phoenissae* the death of Menoeceus is only given the briefest of mentions at the beginning of a long messenger speech which describes the deaths of the other members of the Seven against Thebes (Eur. *Phoen.* 1090–1199):

> ἐπεὶ Κρέοντος παῖς ὁ γῆς ὑπερθανὼν
> πύργων ἐπ' ἄκρων στὰς μελάνδετον ξίφος
> λαιμῶν διῆκε, τῇδε γῇ σωτηρίαν … (Eur. *Phoen.* 1090–1092)
>
> When Creon's son, who died on the land's behalf, had stood on top of the battlements and plunged the dark sword into his throat, achieving survival for this land …

By contrast, Statius focuses much more closely on the moment of death itself, a kind of failed *deuotio*,[18] and in particular adds seemingly unnecessary details to the process of his suicide. Menoeceus not only stabs himself with a sword (as his Euripidean counterpart had), but also plunges headlong in an attempt to take a few of the Argive enemy with him. Furthermore, Statius carefully re-orders the plot inherited from Euripides to ensure that

17 On the anger of Oedipus and further indications of the connection with Sophocles' *OC* at *Theb.* 11.692–698 and 748–752, see Heslin (2008) 112–113.

18 On the importance of *deuotio* for this episode in Statius, see Heinrich (1999). On *deuotio* in Virgil's *Aeneid*, see Panoussi (2009) 45–80.

Menoeceus' death in closely linked to that of Capaneus.[19] Both deaths occur at the end of book 10, both occur on the same walls and much of the language which describes Menoeceus before his suicide links him to Capaneus.

Yet although there is no overt linguistic allusion to a Greek intertext, the nature of Menoeceus' death, in particular the method of suicide, compels us to think of other characters who have jumped from walls in Theban plays. The hero's over-determined plunge from the walls is strongly suggestive of Evadne's suicide in the Euripides' *Supplices* (Eur. *Supp.* 980–1113). In this scene, Evadne appears at Eleusis without warning and, dressed as a bride, jumps from the walls onto the funeral pyre of her dead husband, Capaneus:

ΕΥ. ὁρῶ δὴ τελευτὰν
ἵν' ἕστακα (τύχα δέ μοι
ξυνάπτει ποδὸς ἁλλαγάς),
εὐκλεΐας χάριν ἔνθεν ὁρ–
μάσω τᾶσδ' ἀπὸ πέτρας·
πηδήσασα ⟨δὲ⟩ πυρὸς ἔσω
σῶμα τ' αἴθοπι φλογμῷ
πόσει συμμείξασα φίλῳ,
χρῶτα χρῷ πέλας θεμένα,
Φερσεφόνας ἥξω θαλάμους,
σὲ τὸν θανόντ' οὔποτ' ἐμᾷ
προδοῦσα ψυχᾷ κατὰ γᾶς.
ἴτω φῶς γάμοι τ'· ⟨εὐ–
τυχ⟩οῖθ' αἵτινες εὐναὶ
δικαίων ὑμεναίων ἐν Ἄργει
φανῶσιν τέκνοις, ὅσιος δ'
εὐναῖος ⟨ναίοι⟩ γαμέτας
συντακεὶς αὔραις ἀδόλοις
γενναίας ἀλόχοιο.[20] (Eur. *Supp.* 1012–1030)

I see that my journey's end is here where I stand (for fortune is stepping along with me), and it is here that to win glory I shall launch myself from this cliff. After leaping into the fire, joining my body in the glowing flame with my dear husband, and laying my flesh near his, I shall come to the marriage-chamber of Persephone! Never, where my life in concerned, shall I abandon you lying dead beneath the earth! Light the bridal torch, begin the marriage! ⟨May good luck attend you,⟩ all lawful marriages that may come to my children in Argos! And may the wedded bridegroom, as goodness ordains, ⟨dwell⟩ fused in love to the pure impulse of his noble wife.

---

[19] Capaneus himself emphasizes the connection (*Theb.* 10.845–846). On this see Ripoll (1998) 232 and Ganiban (2007) 136–144.

[20] The text is, as Morwood (2007) 223 notes, "extremely corrupt and unmetrical" especially at the end of Evadne's speech.

> at pius electa murorum in parte Menoeceus
> iam sacer aspectu solitoque augustior ore,
> ceu subito in terras supero demissus ab axe,
> constitit …
> sic ait, insignemque animam mucrone corusco
> dedignantem artus pridem maestamque teneri
> arripit atque uno quaesitam uulnere rumpit.
> sanguine tunc spargit turres et moenia lustrat,
> *seque super medias acies*, nondum ense remisso,
> *iecit et in saeuos cadere est conatus Achiuos*.
> ast illum amplexae Pietas Virtusque ferebant
> leniter ad terras corpus; nam spiritus olim
> ante Iouem et summis apicem sibi poscit in astris.
>
> (Stat. *Theb*. 10.756–759, 774–782)

> But pious Menoeceus took his stand on a chosen part of the walls. Sacred now his aspect, more august than his wonted countenance, as though he had suddenly been sent from heaven down to earth, he stood … So he speaks and with flashing blade seizes the noble soul that has long disdained its body and grieved to be in durance, probes with one stroke, and breaks. Then he bespatters the towers with his blood and purifies the walls *and throws himself upon the midst of the lines* not yet letting go his sword, *trying to fall against the fierce Achaeans*. But Piety and Valor took him in their arms and bore his body gently down to earth. For his spirit is long since before Jupiter, claiming for itself a pinnacle among the highest stars.

The scene in the *Supplices* is, by the standards of ancient tragedy, quite extraordinary. Evadne's desire is to join her husband in the most literal way possible. It seems an especially appropriate comparison for Statius to make. Epic can, of course, do what tragedy (normally) cannot in showing the deaths of protagonists "live," as it were, without the intermediate voice of a messenger. Yet in bringing Menoeceus' suicide before our eyes and in linking it to that of Capaneus, the epic poet also brings to mind what was arguably Euripides' most daring moment of theatricality, when Evadne breaks all convention and commits suicide before the eyes of the audience. The marital link between Evadne and Capaneus in Euripides mirrors the thematic link in Statius between Menoeceus and Capaneus. However, this also creates a parallel between Menoeceus and Evadne which highlights unusual characteristics of the young Theban. In the *Phoenissae*, Menoeceus is too young to fight and, not wishing to be branded a coward, deceives his father in order to sacrifice himself for the safety of his city.[21] In the Statian

---

[21] On the Menoeceus episode in Euripides, see Foley (2001) 123–125.

text, however, Menoeceus' youth is not a problem; indeed, he is pulled from a violent and very successful *aristeia* by the divine personification of *Virtus* in order to commit his bizarre self-sacrifice. The comparison with Evadne suggests that gender roles are being problematized here. Menoeceus is pulled away from a manly activity, fighting the enemy, in order to imitate a grieving wife. He is lured from the fighting by the rather odd *Virtus*, a female personification of the quintessentially male quality.[22] Finally, his pseudo-*deuotio* is itself a failed act of manliness; the divinities *Pietas* and *Virtus* carry him to earth too gently to do any damage to the enemy and everyone who witnesses his suicide is so impressed that there is a brief lull in the fighting so that the Thebans can recover the body.

Although this play on gender roles is fascinating, we should focus on the mechanism for activating this set of readings of Menoeceus. Rather than explore one particular and perhaps more obvious Euripidean play, Statius combines this with allusion to a further, seemingly less appropriate text in order to generate a richness of meaning and resonance with the tragic material which he is manipulating in his own epic poem. This careful employment of Greek texts suggests to me a sophisticated mastery of medium. The two processes of allusive behavior which we have outlined here, the self-conscious reversal of themes in the targeted text and the amalgamation of multiple texts in the target author to create a new and provocative synthetic whole, are thought-provoking when taken alongside the aggressively Latin identity that Statius assumes in books 4 and 5 of the *Siluae*.

4. *Literary Imperialism in Latin Athens*

Thoughts of Euripides' Evadne draw us forward to think of her Statian incarnation. This Evadne leads the Argive widows to Athens, not to suicide, but to supplication of Theseus. Furthermore, the mechanics of allusion to, and control of Greek tragedy, is replicated in the depiction of Athens in *Thebaid* 12. The general plot of the final book evokes Euripides *Supplices* in particular. Yet that play is particularly tightly wedded to its contemporary context in 420s BCE Athens; Athens and its king, Theseus, are beacons of democratic and moral light in the Greek wilderness. In the *Supplices*, Euripides has Theseus vaunt the democratic ideals of Athens:

22 On the personification of *uirtus*, see Feeney (1991) 325–328.

ΚΗ. τίς γῆς τύραννος; πρὸς τίν᾽ ἀγγεῖλαί με χρὴ
λόγους Κρέοντος, ὃς κρατεῖ Κάδμου χθονὸς
Ἐτεοκλέους θανόντος ἀμφ᾽ ἑπταστόμους
πύλας ἀδελφῇ χειρὶ Πολυνείκους ὕπο;
ΘΗ. πρῶτον μὲν ἤρξω τοῦ λόγου ψευδῶς, ξένε,
ζητῶν τύραννον ἐνθάδ᾽· οὐ γὰρ ἄρχεται
ἑνὸς πρὸς ἀνδρός, ἀλλ᾽ ἐλευθέρα πόλις.
δῆμος δ᾽ ἀνάσσει διαδοχαῖσιν ἐν μέρει
ἐνιαυσίαισιν, οὐχὶ τῷ πλούτῳ διδοὺς
τὸ πλεῖστον, ἀλλὰ χὠ πένης ἔχων ἴσον.
ΚΗ. ἓν μὲν τόδ᾽ ἡμῖν ὥσπερ ἐν πεσσοῖς δίδως
κρεῖσσον· πόλις γὰρ ἧς ἐγὼ πάρειμ᾽ ἄπο
ἑνὸς πρὸς ἀνδρός, οὐκ ὄχλῳ, κρατύνεται ... (Eur. *Supp*. 399–411)

Her: Who is the land's master? To whom shall I bring a message from Creon, who controls Cadmus' land since Eteocles was killed near the seven gates in fraternal bloodshed by Polynices?
Th: To begin with, stranger, you started your speech on a false note by asking for the master here. The city is not ruled by a single man but is free. The people rule, and offices are held by yearly turns: they do not assign the highest honors to the rich, but the poor also have an equal share.
Her: Your words put me one point ahead, as in a game of draughts. The city I have come from is ruled by one man and not by a rabble.

Theseus' long reply to the Theban herald (426–462) is a powerful condemnation of tyranny as a political system. Furthermore, his careful examination of the case for burial of the Argive dead results in his appeal to a panhellenic sense of *nomos* (513–563):

ἢ δῆλα τἀνθένδ᾽· εἶμι καὶ θάψω βίᾳ.
οὐ γάρ ποτ᾽ εἰς Ἕλληνας ἐξοισθήσεται
ὡς εἰς ἔμ᾽ ἐλθὼν καὶ πόλιν Πανδίονος
νόμος παλαιὸς δαιμόνων διεφθάρη. (Eur. *Supp*. 560–563)

Otherwise, what comes next is plain: I will come and bury them by force. The news shall never be brought to the Greeks that the ancient law of the gods, coming before me and the city of Pandion, was there annulled.

This contemporary Athenian context is carefully changed by Statius. As with our previous examples, there is no really tight linguistic allusion to that tragic text. Indeed, we again get the impression of Greek literature being processed into Roman epic.[23] Here again we see the mechanisms

23 Although the process cuts both ways: even at a most Virgilian moment, Theseus' killing of Creon in *Thebaid* 12, Greek tragedy's political and moral categories are being employed; cf. Bessone (2011) 150–156.

of reversal and amalgamation controlling this transformation of tragedy. Athens becomes a Roman imperial state ruled by triumphalist *imperator*. Central to the burial of the Argive dead is not a Greek sense of *nomos*, but a very Roman desire to impose *mores* upon uncivilized Greek people (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 12.851–853):

> iamque domos patrias Scythicae post aspera gentis
> proelia laurigero subeuntem Thesea curru
> laetifici plausus missusque ad sidera uulgi
> clamor et emeritis hilaris tuba nuntiat armis.
> ante ducem spolia et, duri Mauortis imago,
> uirginei currus cumulataque fercula cristis
> et tristes ducuntur equi truncaeque bipennes,
> quis nemora et solidam Maeotida caedere suetae,
> gorytique leues portantur et ignea gemmis
> cingula et informes dominarum sanguine peltae.
> ipsae autem nondum trepidae sexumue fatentur,
> nec uulgare gemunt, aspernanturque precari,
> et tantum innuptae quaerunt delubra Mineruae.
> primus amor niueis uictorem cernere uectum
> quadriiugis; nec non populos in semet agebat
> Hippolyte, iam blanda genas patiensque mariti
> foederis. hanc patriae ritus fregisse seueros
> Atthides oblique secum mirantur operto
> murmure, quod nitidi crines, quod pectora palla
> tota latent, magnis quod barbara semet Athenis
> misceat atque hosti ueniat paritura marito. (Stat. *Theb.* 12.519–539)

> And now joyous applause and the shout of the multitude sent up to the stars and cheerful trumpet announces Theseus returning in his laureled chariot to his native city after fierce battles with Scythia's folk, his hard warfare done. Before the chief spoils are led and, image of hard Mavors, virgin chariots, wagons piled with crests, sad horses, broken axes with which women were wont to cleave forests and frozen Maeotis; light quivers are carried and belts blazing with gems and bucklers marred by the blood of their mistresses. They themselves have no fear as yet nor confess their sex; they do not lament in the common fashion and scorn to plead, they only seek the shrine of virgin Minerva. First desire is to see the victor, borne by four snowy horses. Hippolyte too draws the people to herself, now bland of eye and patient of the marriage bond. Aside among themselves the women of Athens mutter, wondering that she has broken the austere usages of her country in that her hair is sleek and her bosom all covered by her mantle, that she blends herself, a barbarian, with great Athens and comes to bear children to her foeman husband.[24]

---

[24] On this passage, cf. Heslin (2008) 124–126 and Augoustakis (2010a) 77–80.

terrarum leges et mundi foedera mecum
defensura cohors, dignas insumite mentes
coeptibus: hac omnem diuumque hominumque fauorem
Naturamque ducem coetusque silentis Auerni
stare palam est … (Stat. *Theb.* 12.642–646)

Soldiers, who will defend with me the laws of earth and the world's covenants, think as befits our enterprise. Plain it is that all favor of gods and men and Nature our leader and the multitudes of silent Avernus stand on our side …

This all seems reasonably straightforward, but the Roman, triumphalist Theseus returning with barbarian wife in tow does not necessarily deeply connect with the Theseus and Athens of classical tragedy. The *leges et foedera* which Theseus defends might seem disconnected from the *nomos* of his fifth century counterpart. Yet the link between the two is inscribed in the *ara Clementiae* to which the Argive women flock before supplicating Theseus:[25]

ipsos nam credere dignum
caelicolas, tellus quibus hospita semper Athenae,
ceu leges hominemque nouum ritusque sacrorum
seminaque in uacuas hinc descendentia terras,
sic sacrasse loco commune animantibus aegris
confugium, unde procul starent iraeque minaeque
regnaque, et a iustis Fortuna recederet aris.
iam tunc innumerae norant altaria gentes:
huc uicti bellis patriaque a sede fugati
regnorumque inopes scelerumque errore nocentes
conueniunt pacemque rogant; mox hospita sedes
uicit et Oedipodae Furias et funus †olynthi
texit et a misero matrem summouit Oreste. (Stat. *Theb.* 12.499–511)

For we may fitly believe that the sky-dwellers themselves, to whom Athens has always been hospitable ground, just as they gave laws and a new man and sacred rites and seeds hence descending into empty soils, even so hallowed in the place a common refuge for living creatures in trouble, whence anger and threats and monarchies should stand far removed and Fortune withdraw from the righteous altar. Already to countless races was that altar known. Thither the vanquished in wars and the banished from fatherland, those who had lost their thrones and those guilty of crimes through error, assemble and ask for peace. By and by the hospitable abode conquered Oedipus' Furies and sheltered the ruin of Olynthus (?)[26] and removed his mother from happy Orestes.

---

25 On the altar, see Burgess (1972); Braund (1996b); Ripoll (1998) 440–446; Ganiban (2007) 214–225; Bessone (2011) 106–111 and (2013) 153–156.

26 Heslin (2008) 122–124 provides an elegant explanation for the mention of Olynthus as an allusion to Athenian oratory which then sets up an implicit comparison between Athenian institutions and Rome as an asylum.

The description of the altar begins with a celebration of the laws and marks of civilization for which Athens is famed. There is nothing panhellenic about the *leges* now, however; what is more, the description culminates, not with further examples of Athenian institutions, but with two tragic heroes saved by the power of Athenian mercy. The text has some peculiarities here: the use of *mox* with the perfect *uicit* to describe Oedipus' appearance in what can only be the future is easy to understand but harder to explain;[27] the Furies pursuing Oedipus again suggests allusion to Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus*.[28] Meanwhile Orestes, who is more normally associated with Furies, is here pursued by his mother. The blurring of chronology and mythical traditions may be a deliberate move on Statius' part. Nonetheless, there is a strange anachronism about the altar: events which can only happen in the future are described as though they have already happened; the most popular features of tragic myth have been changed and convoluted—Oedipus is chased by Furies, Orestes by his mother. Again, these re-workings of myth seem to be symbolic of Statius' appropriation and control of classical tragedy. The same processes of reversal and amalgamation are encoded in the fabric of Athens and its most important (in this context) monument. The transformation of Statian Athens into a quasi-Roman city with an autocratic, quasi-Roman ruler is predicated upon the transformation of Statius' literary inheritance and the historical context of that literature. Statius' altar symbolizes the literary process of Romanizing tragedy.

5. *Conclusion: Statius' Greek Poem*

As we have seen in the *Siluae* written after the completion of the *Thebaid*, Statius draws a strong contrast between Greek and Roman modes of poetry. Furthermore, he portrays himself as a "Latin" poet, using a strict geographical demarcation to underline his cultural self-positioning.[29] Yet this pose does not involve the rejection of Greek poetic influences, even those from classical or pre-classical sources. My desire to see the Cyclic *Thebaid* in the background to the Flavian may be a case of scholarly wishful thinking, but

27 All three examples are described with verbs in the perfect tense (*uicit* … *texit* … *summouit*, 510–511).

28 Heslin (2008) 121; Bessone (2011) 120.

29 Although this is further complicated by the Neapolitan poetic identity which Newlands identifies in *Siluae* 3.5 in particular; see Newlands (2012) 136–159.

it seems fair to say that Statius has Greek tragedy in mind, even if he is not binding his Latin text tightly to it. Instead, Statius shows his independence from his literary inheritance, not through outright rejection, but through subtler processes of reversal and amalgamation of tragic plots, scenes, and characterizations. The Athens of Greek tragedy, a city which symbolizes the ideals of its society, is taken over by Statius and used instead to express a very Roman and Flavian set of political themes. The choice of Thebes as subject-matter for a Roman poet sets significant limits on Statius as an author; he expressly rejects the opportunity to write about Domitian and his conquests but also eschews the possibility of a mythological theme which anticipates the current imperial regime. This is not the choice made by Virgil, nor by Statius' contemporaries, Valerius and Silius. The Greek theme allows Statius to anticipate something different; he can look forward from the mythical past to a literary future where Roman literary *mores* control the Greek predecessors.

POLIS, COURT, EMPIRE: GREEK CULTURE, ROMAN SOCIETY, AND THE SYSTEM OF GENRES IN STATIUS' POETRY

Federica Bessone

First of all I apologize for the encyclopedic title, which refers to a more extensive research project yet to be pursued. Here I will limit myself to analyzing the programmatic passages of the two epics in relation to the *Siluae*, focusing on Statius' self-representation as a poet and on the importance of Greek models in it. I will argue that mythic, literary, and sociological models of the poet as a *uates* or a performer, "singing with the lyre"—whether a real or a symbolic one—in front of an audience, on a given occasion, are crucial to Statius' construction of his poetic *persona*.[1] Different phases of Greek literary culture serve to define the role of a professional poet, confronting the diverse modalities of literary communication in Flavian Rome.

An archaic and yet contemporary poet, Statius constructs himself as a living myth, an inspired *aoidos* invested with an outstanding social function; by recalling the mythic origins of the poet's trade, he ennobles the role he plays in imperial society, in a context of recovered orality: a situation in which writing cohabits with performance in the Hellenizing *agones*, with commissioned improvisation or high-speed composition, as well as with the practice of *recitationes*.

The omnipresent and omnivalent symbol of the lyre (competing with that of the file) holds the oeuvre of Statius together under a single sign, as I will demonstrate; from epic to the generic experimentalism of the *Siluae*, from the poem which is *uigilatum* over long years to the occasional poems for the cultural consumption of the élite, different poetic forms appear to be connected by a common trait: the claim to the social status of the poet *as such* and of the prestige due to him, *whatever* performance he offers to the audience, or to the different kinds of audience. The distance between literary genres, which are distinct, but practised in parallel by a complete professional, tends to diminish: the consciousness of a hierarchy persists,

[1] My debt to Rosati (2013) will be acknowledged below.

but it is one that is modified by a new generic relativism, in response to the socio-cultural and economic conditions of the Flavian age.

The crisis of Maecenatism and the evolution of patronage in comparison to the Augustan model lead to a redefinition of the system of genres and to a new assessment of the literary tradition, for a personal and self-interested use. In Statius as in Martial, we observe creative strategies of adaptation to the circumstances, a daring revision of aesthetic canons, and the proposal of new artistic forms for the cultural consumption of the imperial élite—the *Siluae* are the most interesting outcome of this tendency.

A poetry that bestows distinction upon the upper class society bases itself on an assertion of the poet's social prestige: a circle of reciprocal legitimation between the artist and his patrons is created.[2] Statius fosters his own myth through incessant self-promotion and, as he advertises himself as an epic poet temporarily lent to a minor genre, at the same time he sponsors an image of himself as a Hellenizing epideictic poet, successful performer, virtuoso improviser, extempore or high-speed composer: an image of a professional poet which is presented not as alternative, but as complementary to that of the epic *uates* (and which seems to insinuate itself even into some parts of the major poem, the *Thebaid*). Driven by concrete necessities, a polyvalent author—in the Ovidian manner—awards in fact equal nobility to poetic forms of different rank, continually alternating in his production: Statius innovates the model of Virgil's poetic career, which was teleologically oriented towards the sublime; and, as a full-range professional, he tries to harmonize his own choices as a poet with the different needs of his audience, from literary friends to the general reader, from private patrons to the emperor.

1. *Greek Origins and Imperial Rome*

1.1. *A Living Myth: The Proem to the* Achilleid

The epilogue to the *Thebaid* is perhaps the most studied passage of all Flavian epic.[3] Here I would like to focus just on two verses: *iam te magnanimus dignatur noscere Caesar, / Itala iam studio discit memoratque iuuentus*

---

2 Zeiner (2005); Newlands (2009).

3 On the epilogue see Rosati (2008) with bibliography (176 n. 1); Gärtner (2008); Bessone (2011) 34–36.

("already great-hearted Caesar deigns to know you, and the studious youth of Italy learns you and recites," 12.814–815). This claim to the role of Roman national *uates*, acknowledged by the emperor and by the Italic youth, has already been traced back to Horace's ode to Melpomene:[4]

> Romae, principis urbium,
> dignatur suboles inter amabilis
> uatum ponere me choros,
> et iam dente minus mordeor inuido. (Hor. *Carm.* 4.3.13–16)

> The youth of Rome, queen of cities, sees fit to give me a place in the well-loved choir of lyric poets, and now I am less often bitten by the tooth of Envy.

Statius surpasses the Horatian boast, splitting up the phrase *Romae … dignatur suboles* so as to distinguish between the different components of his audience, the emperor who deigns (*dignatur*) to know his poem and the Italic youth (*Itala … iuuentus*) that learns it by heart; the Flavian poet adds to the self-representation in Horatian terms the pride of having already become Virgil's successor, as official poet of the empire and a school classic.

The proem to the *Achilleid* has attracted less attention; and yet this prologue adds a further important dimension to the poet's self-presentation:

> Magnanimum Aeaciden formidatamque Tonanti
> progeniem et patrio uetitam succedere caelo,
> diua, refer. quamquam acta uiri multum inclita cantu
> Maeonio (sed plura uacant), nos ire per omnem
> (sic amor est) heroa uelis Scyroque latentem
> Dulichia proferre tuba nec in Hectore tracto
> sistere, sed tota iuuenem deducere Troia.
> tu modo, si ueterem digno depleuimus haustu,
> da fontes mihi, Phoebe, nouos ac fronde secunda
> necte comas: neque enim Aonium nemus aduena pulso
> nec mea nunc primis augescunt tempora uittis.
> scit Dircaeus ager meque inter prisca parentum
> nomina cumque suo numerant Amphione Thebae.
> At tu, quem longe primum stupet Itala uirtus
> Graiaque, cui geminae florent uatumque ducumque
> certatim laurus (olim dolet altera uinci),
> da ueniam ac trepidum patere hoc sudare parumper
> puluere: te longo necdum fidente paratu
> molimur magnusque tibi praeludit Achilles. (Stat. *Ach.* 1.1–19)

4 See Rosati (2013) 83–84.

> Goddess, tell of great-hearted Aeacides and offspring feared of the Thunderer and forbidden to succeed to his father's heaven. The hero's deeds, 'tis true, are much famed in Maeonian song, but more are yet to celebrate. Be it your pleasure that I (so I crave) traverse the whole hero, bringing him forth by Dulichian trump as he hides in Scyros, nor stopping at Hector's drag, but singing the warrior through Troy's whole story. Only do you, Phoebus, grant me new founts if I have drained the old one with a worthy draught, and bind my hair with a second [*or*: with auspicious] leafage; for no stranger do I knock at the Aonian grove, nor are these the first fillets to amplify my temples. The land of Dirce knows it, and Thebes numbers me among her forbears' ancient names along with her own Amphion.
>
> But you, the wonder of Italy's and Greece's manhood first by far, for whom the twin laurels of bards and captains flourish in rivalry (one of the twain is long since said to be surpassed), give me good leave; suffer me in my eagerness to sweat awhile in this dust. On you I work in long and not yet confident preparing, and great Achilles is your prelude.

Here I would like to focus on verses 8–13. The epic narrator asks Apollo for inspiration in the name of the success obtained with his previous epos. The grove of the Muses is in Boeotia (*Aonium nemus*), and here the poet of the *Thebaid* is no stranger (*neque ... aduena*): this is also the theatre of the events that he has narrated (*arma ... / Aonia*, *Theb*. 1.33–34).[5] This double sense prepares the development of verses 12–13, where the geography of the Theban poem overlaps with that of poetic initiation. *Scit Dircaeus ager*: *ager* may suggest the battlefield that witnessed the fights of the Seven against Thebes, while *Dircaeus* might recall Dirce as an authoritative fount of Pindar's poetry.[6]

More interesting for us is the following image: meque inter *prisca parentum / nomina ... numerant ... Thebae*. On a first reading, there is a disorienting effect: what is Statius doing "in the midst of" Thebes' ancestors?[7] The language suggests in fact the recording in an official list, like the register of the illustrious ancestors, the oldest citizens or even the founders.[8] The program-

---

5 Barchiesi (1996) 54 sees a reference to the Theban war (cf. *Theb*. 7.628–631), mediated by Prop. 3.3.41–42 and suggested by *pulso*: "una sorta di occupazione militare della Beozia"; the verb seems to condense different ideas, first of all the Platonic image of "knocking at the door of the Muses" (cf. Gibson [2006] 346). Heslin (2005) 77–78 follows Barchiesi but interprets this as Statius' distancing from his anti-Callimachean *Thebaid*.

6 Cf. Pind. *Isthm*. 6.74–76 with Privitera (1982), *Ol*. 10.84–85; Hor. *Ep*. 1.3.10, *Carm*. 4.2.25; see Barchiesi (1996) 54 and n. 22; Fedeli and Ciccarelli (2008) 136.

7 Hall (2007) prints his conjecture *canentum* (referring in the apparatus to the gloss *poetarum* in r).

8 With *inter ... nomina*, cf. Ov. *Pont*. 3.1.55–58; Sil. 8.253–256 and 11.511–512. For the official

matic passages of Augustan poetry make the reader look in the opposite direction, to the wishes for fame that projects itself into the future, among the descendants of Rome. So does Propertius: meque inter *seros laudabit Roma nepotes: / illum post cineres auguror ipse diem* ("I, too, will be praised by late generations of Rome: I myself predict that after I am ashes such a day will come," Prop. 3.1.35–36).

Statius inverts his assertion of glory and projects himself into the past, the Greek past, among the ancestors of Thebes. It is a paradox—and a paradox that has gone unnoticed, or has been underestimated.[9] Its sense is made clear immediately after, by the addition *cumque suo … Amphione*. The inclusion among the ancestors explains itself by the metaphorical approach of the *Thebaid*'s author to the mythic *uates* and founder of Thebes, Amphion:[10] the bard who had constructed the city walls to the song of the lyre (given to him by its inventor, Hermes).[11]

But the paradoxical import of Statius' assertion remains intact: this is a challenging hyperbole. Two elements are remarkable here: the self-presentation as a transnational poet and the assimilation to the mythic *uates*.

1.2. *Honorary Citizenship*

There is, first of all, the idea of an "honorary citizenship," conferred on Statius by the Greek city for his poetic merits—also specific merits, like singing the glorious past of Thebes (if one can call it "glorious"). This is an ambitious image. For a poet, being exalted by his homeland or claimed as a citizen by one, or even by more presumed homelands is the measure of his success: an honor that in the ancient world is due above all to Homer and contested by several cities. Following the Homeric pattern, Statius himself, in the *Siluae*, ascribes to his father and to Pollius Felix (each of them a citizen of two towns in Magna Graecia) the honor of being "disputed" by two different cities.[12]

---

meaning of the recording of names into a public register, see Liv. 26.36.11 (cf. also, for the "register of ancestors," Ov. *Her*. 11.17–18).

9 A hint in Vessey (1973) 43: "Statius now felt that he had joined the canon of epic poets, had found his place among the *prisca nomina*, in the catalogue of divine poets that stretched back into the remote, indeed mythical, ages of the world."

10 So Juhnke (1972) 163. Heslin (2005) 102 observes: "Statius is like Amphion because he 'constructed Thebes' with his lyre, building the city in the imagination of his audience of his previous epic, stone by stone, word by word"; see also Uccellini (2013) on *inter … nomina*. For the poet as a "builder" of his city's walls, cf. Prop. 4.1.57, with Hutchinson (2006) 71.

11 Cf. *LIMC* 1.1 (1981) 718–719.

12 Cf. *Silu*. 5.3.124–132, with Gibson (2006) 314 and 2.2.133–137, with Newlands (2011) 153–154.

In Latin poetry, the boast of having given fame to one's native city, and of being considered its glory, is a recurrent motif. Consider Ovid, for instance, in the *sphragis* of the *Amores*: *Mantua Vergilio gaudet, Verona Catullo; / Paelignae dicar gloria gentis ego* … ("Mantua joys in Virgil, Verona in Catullus; I shall be called the glory of the Paelignans …," Ov. *Am.* 3.15.7–8). So does Propertius, in the programmatic first elegy of the fourth book, where together with Rome's walls his native Umbria is designated as a *patria* that can be proud of its aetiological poet, the Roman Callimachus: *ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Vmbria libris, / Vmbria Romani patria Callimachi!* ("that Umbria may swell with pride at my books, Umbria, the home of Rome's Callimachus," Prop. 4.1.63–64).[13] The "boast of the poet's birthplace" is a motif that Statius himself employs in his praise of Lucan: in *Silu.* 2.7.24–35, he extols the *Hispania Baetica*, which not even Mantua could compete with; a comparison between poets is expressed as a comparison between their homelands.[14]

This campanilistic motif, an expression of local, as well as of national, patriotism,[15] is sometimes associated with the boast of having transported Greek elements for the first time to the Latin world: not only to Rome, but to one's own native town and Italic homeland; it is linked, that is, with the *primus ego* motif, by means of which Latin poets since Ennius, but above all the Augustans, assert the achievement of equality with the greatest Greek models in each literary genre. It is the boast of Horace, who, as he proclaims in *Carm.* 3.30.10–14, will be praised in Apulia for being the first to have transferred Aeolic lyric into Latin; or that of Virgil, who, in the proem in the middle of the *Georgics* (3.10–15 and 19–20), imagines that he will first lead the Muses from Helicon to Mantua, returning from Greece as a winner.[16]

Statius reverses the direction of this well-known *topos*: in the proem to the *Achilleid* the movement is no more from Greece to Rome, but, implicitly, from Rome to Greece; it is precisely in Greece itself that, thanks to his poetry—written in Latin, but on a Greek subject—he imagines his dreams of glory to be realized. We are a step forward from the epilogue to the *Thebaid*. There Statius had represented himself as Virgil's successor in the role of national poet. Here he declares instead that he intends to integrate the *Iliad*, competing with the greatest Greek poet on the greatest Greek hero:

---

13 Cf. also Prop. 4.1A.67–68.
14 See Newlands (2011) 231–233.
15 Fraenkel (1957) 304–305.
16 Cf. also *G.* 2.173–176. On the *primus ego* motif, see Citroni (2001).

for that reason, he exhibits his specifically Hellenic credentials and shows himself to be already at home in Hellas, to be already a "naturalized" Greek, thanks to the poem on Thebes.

Thus the perspective has broadened; here there is a sense of a double cultural belonging, reflected in the following eulogy of Domitian: the emperor and poet, superior to Achilles and Homer (and implicitly to Statius himself); Domitian, "the wonder of Italy's and Greece's manhood first by far" (*Ach.* 1.14–15)—the *iunctura* of *Itala iuuentus*, from the *sphragis* to the *Thebaid*, becomes here, by expansion, *Itala uirtus / Graiaque*. In talking about the emperor, Statius keeps talking indirectly about himself; in fact he seems to allot to himself, even more than to the prince, the Greco-Roman primacy that Propertius had assigned to the author of the *Aeneid* (*cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai! / nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade*, "Make way, ye Roman writers, make way, ye Greeks! Something greater than the Iliad is coming to birth," Prop. 2.34.65–66).

1.3. *Exporting the Muse? A Transnational* uates

Another aspect seems meaningful to me. The idea of measuring oneself against Greek authors, genres, and themes is no longer expressed here, as in the Augustan poets, through the image of bringing to Italy something Greek (even less so for the first time); it is no matter of "importing the Muse" (to use Stephen Hinds' phrase),[17] but rather of *exporting*, in a sense, *one's own* Muse, travelling in the opposite direction to the Hellenization of Roman culture, and moving now from the center to the periphery of the empire.

A similar reversal is seen in *Silu.* 4.7 to Vibius Maximus. There Statius asks Pindar for lyric inspiration, claiming the merit of having "hallowed" the homeland of the Greek lyric poet through his epic poetry in Latin:

> tuque, regnator lyricae cohortis,
> da noui paulum mihi iura plectri,
> si tuas cantu Latio sacraui,
> Pindare, Thebas. (Stat. *Silu.* 4.7.5–8)

> And you, Pindar, ruler of the lyric band, grant me for a little while the right to change my quill, if I have hallowed your Thebes in Latian song.

Statius abandons the modesty pose of Horace, who, though often Pindarizing, declared Pindar unattainable—a sublime swan, as against the bee of the Matinus (*Carm.* 4.2.1–4 and 25–32); instead, the Flavian poet puts himself on

[17] Hinds (1998) 52.

a level with the poet of Thebes, showing that he has done what Pindar himself promised to do, namely to give glory to the city through his song.[18] The emphasis has significantly changed from the image, favored by the Augustan poets, of adapting Greek forms and meters to Latin poetry. Consider, for instance, Horace on the "Pindaric" Titius: *quid Titius, Romana breui uenturus in ora, / Pindarici fontis qui non expalluit haustus, / fastidire lacus et riuos ausus apertos? / … fidibusne Latinis / Thebanos aptare modos studet auspice Musa …?* ("What of Titius, soon to be on the lips of Romans, who quailed not at draughts of the Pindaric spring, but dared to scorn the open pools and streams? … Does he essay, under favor of the Muse, to fit Theban measures to the Latin lyre?" *Ep.* 1.3.9–13).

In the *Siluae*, Statius goes further than that—or, rather, moves in a different direction—with a self-conscious audacity which is hardly disguised by the pretext of the shared Theban matter. In spite of the reverence he displays, asking Pindar, as a god, for inspiration, Statius seems to aspire to an "identification," or at least a twinning, with the Theban lyricist; in a similar way, in the opening of his third book (3.1.1–4), Propertius invokes Callimachus and Philetas to be admitted in their sacred grove, and thus he places himself alongside the canonical models of Hellenistic elegy.

Statius' ambition to put himself on a level with the Theban lyricist, which in the *Siluae* is an authoritative legitimation of his own occasional and encomiastic poetry, seems to lurk between the lines also in the *Achilleid*'s opening. The boast itself of being honored at Thebes as a citizen poet, beside the legendary Amphion, could bring to mind the true poetic glory of Thebes and of historical Thebes, precisely Pindar—this is what the strophe of *Silu.* 4.7 just quoted seems to suggest, almost commenting from a distance on our passage, as well as on the *Thebaid* and its proem. But there may be more.

Even the phrase itself by which, in the two preceding verses, Statius declares himself "no stranger" (*neque … aduena*) to the Theban land, to the places and rites of the Muses, may repeat the boast of a man who was indeed no stranger to Thebes and the Muses. It is striking to discover that a Pindaric fragment, which unfortunately cannot be contextualized, seems to be echoed in this passage, also in the syntactical structure and vocabulary, as if, in proclaiming himself a "Theban" poet, Statius were speaking with the very words of Pindar:

---

18 For instance in *Isthmian* 7, or in fr. 29 and 194 M.; cf. Sevieri (2000). The verb *sacrare* is the same that Statius uses in comparing his own poetry with Virgil's in *Theb.* 10.445–448.

οὔτοι με ξένον
οὐδ' ἀδαήμονα Μοισᾶν ἐπαίδευσαν κλυταὶ
Θῆβαι (Pind. fr. 198a M.)

Glorious Thebes taught me to be no stranger to, nor ignorant of, the Muses.

If we read again lines 10–13 of the *Achilleid*'s proem, we notice that the sequence *neque … aduena … nec … Thebae* recalls the series οὔτοι με ξένον … οὐδ' … Θῆβαι, thereby confirming the honor for poetic merits which makes Statius, on a par with Pindar, a citizen of Thebes.[19]

Statius then presents his poetry as the pride, not of his native Italic land, but of his ideal and adoptive homeland, the cultural homeland that is Greece. To the Neapolitan poet, however, Greece *is*, literally, a homeland: in fact his is not an expatriation, but a return to the motherland. For the "son" of Parthenope—a *Graeca urbs*, as Tacitus defines it (*Ann.* 15.33.2), a colony of Euboea in Magna Graecia—being welcomed in Thebes is the claim to a belonging and a confirmation of his Greek identity: the identity of which Statius is proud and which he assigns to his father in *Siluae* 5.3 with pride; in this *epicedion*, Parthenope is invited to honor a "son" who is superior to any son that Athens, Cyrene or Sparta have ever produced, and who alone could demonstrate the nobility and Greek descent of his city.[20]

It has recently been said that Statius is a poet with *tria corda*: Greek, Roman, and Neapolitan.[21] In *Siluae* 5.3 and in the poem to his wife, he boasts of his birth and cultural formation in *nostra … Parthenope* (*Silu.* 3.5.78–79); more ambitiously, in the epilogue to the *Thebaid*, he fashions himself before the emperor and to the Italian audience as the new Virgil and Roman national poet; in the proem to the *Achilleid*, finally, comparing himself to Homer and to the legendary poet-founder of Thebes, he extols himself at the same time as the glory of Greece and as a living mythic *aoidos*: he thus completes his own image presenting himself as a true transnational *uates*.

1.4. *A "New Amphion"*

The metaphor of the "citizenship *ad honorem*" in recognition of poetic merits is revealing. Another Flavian poet employs it as a self-promotional

---

19 On another striking Pindaric allusion in the very first lines of the *Achilleid* (cf. *Isthm.* 8.33–35), see Barchiesi (1996) 48 and also 54, on the Pindaric theme of Achilles' education (cf. *Nem.* 3.43–64).

20 *Silu.* 5.3.104–111.

21 Rosati (2011). See now Newlands (2012).

move. Martial, who in the first book of his *Epigrams* already proclaims himself the glory of Bilbilis (Mart. 1.61.11–12), toys further with the idea that other cities are willing to adopt him—even the city of his revered poetic model. In 10.103, preparing to return to Spain and wanting to be welcomed there with all honors, he boasts with his *municipes* not only of being for Bilbilis what Catullus had been for Verona, but of being longed for by Verona itself as a citizen: … *ecquid laeta iuuat uestri uos gloria uatis? / nam decus et nomen famaque uestra sumus, / nec sua plus debet tenui Verona Catullo / meque uelit dici non minus illa suum* ("… Do you rejoice in the flourishing fame of your poet? For I am your ornament and renown and glory, nor does his Verona owe more to spare Catullus, or would wish me less to be called hers," 10.103.3–6).[22] Again, in 8.73 he jokingly declares himself capable of being appreciated as a poet by the land of the Paeligni and by Mantua—that is, of being equal to Ovid and Virgil—if only he had a Corinna or an Alexis to love.[23] The partly self-ironic move of the epigrammatist, who assimilates himself to the greatest Latin poets, becomes a hyperbolic self-celebration in Statius, who compares himself even to a mythic founder of poetry.

But this very metaphor, which can express a proud comparison between poets, has a foundation in republican and imperial history. In the *Pro Archia* Cicero defends the eastern-Greek poet, born in Antioch but well integrated in Rome's socio-cultural élite, from the charge of having usurped Roman citizenship. Archias is an important sociological model for Statius: this is the Greek model, represented also by Antipater of Sidon, of the itinerant epideictic poets and orators, welcomed and celebrated in many cities even outside their homeland; a model that we recognize in the figure of Statius' father, a professional poet participating in the musical *agones* in Greece and in Naples, and in Statius himself, who competes in the *ludi Augustales*, *Albani*, and *Capitolini* and offers to his patrons the encomiastic poetry of the *Siluae*.[24]

22 Cf. Damschen (2004) 363.

23 Mart. 8.73.9–10; cf. Schöffel (2002) 617–618. In *Silu.* 4.2.5–10, Statius makes yet another use of the motif: in an encomiastic hyperbole, he laments that he could not celebrate Domitian's banquet properly, even if both Smyrne and Mantua crowned him with laurel, acknowledging him as their poet (9–10)—that is, not even if he were Homer and Virgil at the same time (which in fact he is proud of being, in a sense, as the author of the *Thebaid* and the *Achilleid*).

24 On Statius' and his father's role as Greek professional poets, see above all Hardie (1983); on Papinius' Greek literature teaching, see McNelis (2002) and Bonadeo (2007).

Having become famous in Asia and in Greece through his performances, Archias comes to Magna Graecia and is given the honorary citizenship by Tarentum, Locri, Rhegium, and Naples (Cic. *Arch.* 5).[25] A successful poet, then, who sheds luster on the cities in which he is given hospitality; and yet, Cicero protests, while many towns contend for dead Homer, Rome would like to repudiate a living poet who is in fact already a naturalized Roman, and who, above all, long since "bent all the energies of his genius to celebrating the fame and glory of the Roman people" (Cic. *Arch.* 19).

Statius' case is the reverse of that of Archias: now it is a Roman poet, of Greek origin, who wants the honorary citizenship to be metaphorically conferred on him by a Hellenic town, for having celebrated it in his poetry. Archias sought economic and professional success in the rich Hellenized city of Rome; Statius is in search of cultural prestige and of an honorific acknowledgement in the very homeland of poetry, in its mythic cradle. In the imagination of the Flavian poet, the Hellenization of Rome seems to be replaced by the Romanization of the imperial province: but this is in fact a *return* to Greece of what originated in Greece, a reversion to the root from which, through Magna Graecia, Roman culture and literature itself has developed.

It may be interesting finally to observe that the idea of a stranger welcomed and celebrated by a Greek city alongside its national glories, whether mythic or historical, corresponds to a custom attested in the imperial age: namely, that of granting a benefactor citizenship and honorific titles that assimilate him to the illustrious citizens or the mythic ancestors of that city.[26] The merits which are so rewarded may be of an economic and political nature, a cultural, or even a poetical one.

It may happen that an occasional poet, the star of the moment, is honored like a glory of the past and, literally, alongside it. A decree from Halicarnassus orders the dedication of statues to the itinerant poet Gaius Longianus, from Aphrodisias, "in the most notable places of the city," παρὰ τὸν παλαιὸν Ἡρόδοτον, "next to the ancient Herodotus."[27] In the *Speech to the Rhodians*, Dio Chrysostom mentions that in recognition of his performances the

[25] See Narducci (1992) 33–39 and 57–61; Rosati (2014).

[26] On multiple citizenship in imperial Greece, see now Heller and Pont (2012), and esp. Van Nijf (2012).

[27] Le Bas and Waddington (1870) 1618; see now Roueché (2007), *IAph2007* 12.27 "Honours for C. Julius Longianus poet" (http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph2007/iAph120027.html, accessed 09/25/2013), ii. Cf. Robert (1981) 348 n. 45 and, for the analogy between Statius and Longianus, Markus (2000) 167–168.

Athenians had erected a bronze statue for a "very slovenly" poet, and placed it παρὰ Μένανδρον, "next to Menander."[28] (Dio condemns this indulgence on Athens' part in allowing citizenship and honors to dubious characters, even reassigning to them the statues of great men of the past, by cancelling the inscriptions on the bases and engraving new ones.)[29] The super-rich Iulius Nicanor, from Hierapolis in Syria, had bought Salamis and given it back to the Athenians, and hence he had received from them the title of "new Themistocles," as well as of "new Homer."[30]

These honorific titles also take in the great names of mythic characters. A satirical epigram by Automedon testifies to this, according to which it is enough to bring to Athens ten measures of charcoal, a pig, cabbage-stalks, lentils, or snails to become Triptolemus, Erechtheus, Cecrops, Codrus, or what you want (*AP* 11.319 = *HE* Automedon V; the merit of importing goods is here comically debased to a vile level).[31] Louis Robert, who has framed the epigram in its historical-cultural context, cites various examples of assimilation of a contemporary figure to the founder hero of a *polis*: in the Ionian Teos, the Roman Philistius becomes νέος Ἀθάμας, the "new Athamas," from the name of the Mynian hero; in the near Erythraea, the emperor Lucius Verus receives the title of νέος Ἔρυθρος, the "new Erythros," from the name of the founder; at Argos, Claudia Philomathia is a "new Hypermestra"; at Dorylaeon, in Phrygia, a Stratonicos is called "new Acamas," from Theseus' son. The fashion of the title of "new (founder) hero" replaces, in the imperial age, the cult of the *euergetai* of Hellenistic age, who were honored by the simple title of "second founder"; these "acclamations" (φωναί, εὐφημίαι), Robert writes, "sont caractéristiques des cités de Grèce et d'Asie Mineure, avec leur forte tradition civique et avec la glorie de leur histoire, avec l'orgueil passioné des origines … le sentiment national, celui de la vraie patrie, la cité."[32]

But let us return to Statius. In the proem to the *Achilleid*, as if following contemporary fashion, the poet of the *Thebaid* seems to propose himself as a "new Amphion." The mythic hero of Thebes, founder of the *polis* and poet at one and the same time, is the perfect symbol for an honorific title which

---

[28] Dio Chrys. *Or.* 31.116. On the specific meaning of παρά, "next to," cf. Robert (1981) 348 n. 45.

[29] Cf. Veyne (2007) 144.

[30] Cf. *IG* II^2, 3786–3789 and Bowersock (1965) 96, with bibliography; also Dio Chrys. *Or.* 31.116.

[31] Gow and Page (1968) 1.172–173 n.V and 2.188. Cf. Robert (1981).

[32] Robert (1981) 361.

joins "civil" merits and poetic glory: a combination of elements that we find expressed in the rationalization of the myth of Amphion, as a civilizing hero, in Horace:

> Siluestris homines sacer interpresque deorum
> caedibus et uictu foedo deterruit Orpheus,
> dictus ob hoc lenire tigres rabidosque leones.
> dictus et Amphion, Thebanae conditor urbis,
> saxa mouere sono testudinis et prece blanda
> ducere quo uellet. fuit haec sapientia quondam …
> sic honor et nomen diuinis uatibus atque
> carminibus uenit …
> ne forte pudori
> sit tibi Musa lyrae sollers et cantor Apollo.
>
> (Hor. *Ars* 391–396, 400–401, 406–407)

> While men still roamed the woods, Orpheus, the holy prophet of the gods, made them shrink from bloodshed and brutal living; hence the fable that he tamed tigers and ravening lions; hence too the fable that Amphion, builder of Thebes' citadel, moved stones by the sound of his lyre, and led them whither he would by his supplicating spell. In days of yore, this was wisdom … and so honor and fame fell to bards and their songs, as divine … So you need not blush for the Muse skilled in the lyre, and for Apollo, god of song.

By presenting himself as a new Amphion, Statius aims at not blushing for, indeed being proud of, the poet's name; by appropriating that paradigm of *uita contemplatiua*, useful to the civic community, consecrated by Euripides' *Antiope*,[33] he asserts his own role as a poet in Flavian society.

1.5. *Greek Past, Greek Present*

The inclusion of the Flavian poet at Thebes among the names of the ancestors, alongside Amphion, symbolizes a fame which is acknowledged in the geographical places of the *Thebaid*, but most importantly in the very cradle of poetry: the Greece of mythical singers, the land from which everything originated, and the nation that is at the same time an adoptive homeland, an ideal homeland, and an authentic motherland for the poet of Parthenope (a Roman, a Neapolitan, and a Greek). I would like to recall that the taste for the archaeology of values and the worship of Greek mythic origins is a constant feature of Statius' imagination and ideology: at the heart of the *Thebaid*, the

---

[33] See Natanblut (2009). On the appropriation of Greek tragedy, see Hulls in this volume, pp. 193–213.

Roman imperial ideal of clemency is traced back to the *ara Clementiae*, an originary gift of the gods to the city of Athens.[34]

The image which Statius employs projects him into the most distant past but implies a very contemporary consciousness of the way in which Rome looks to Greece and of the way in which Greece conceives itself and manages its glorious past in the context of empire. An idea of the relationship between Rome and Greece is encapsulated in these verses; Roman poetry, which had its beginning from *Graecia capta*, returns to Greece to receive the most authoritative sanction: to Greece as a perennial and inexhaustible source of cultural and literary prestige. Statius has Rome as his horizon, in Rome he wants himself to be acknowledged as national *uates* and as a fashionable poet: but in Rome he identifies himself with the archetypes of Greek myth, models his role on the profile of the Hellenizing professional poet, and founds his prestige on the "social capital" of Greek culture.

In constructing the image of himself as a Greek poet favored by the Roman élite, Statius follows in the footsteps of his father (*Silu.* 5.3). According to a hypothesis accepted by many, Πόπλιος Παπίνιος Στ⟨άτιος⟩ is the dedicatee of the honorific inscription on a statue base from Athens, which records his initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries.[35] In the proem to the *Achilleid*, Statius imagines for himself an honor conferred upon him by Greece which appears almost modeled on that of his father.

2. *The Lyre and the File*

2.1. *Statius as Amphion in the* Achilleid*, the* Thebaid*, and the* Siluae

Let us now consider the assimilation of the poet to the figure of a mythic *uates*. The pattern of "inclusion in a list," as in an official register, had been employed by the Augustan poets to claim insertion in the canon of a literary genre or a poetic lignée (see Hor. *Carm.* 4.3.13–15 quoted above, where he declares he has achieved the consecration as a lyric poet which was formulated as an aspiration in *Carm.* 1.1.35–36). One could mention here, for instance, Propertius in the *sphragis* to his second book, where he aspires to complete a catalogue of recent Latin poets, above all love poets: *Cynthia quin uiuet uersu laudata Properti, / hos* inter *si me* ponere *Fama uolet* ("Yes,

[34] See the third chapter in Bessone (2011).

[35] Clinton (1972) and (1989) 1514–1515; Holford-Strevens (2000) 39 n. 4.

Cynthia glorified in the pages of Propertius shall live, if Fame consent to rank me with bards like these," Prop. 2.34.93–94).[36]

Statius reuses the pattern of the inclusion, marked by the preposition *inter*, by verbs meaning "to place," "to number" or "to insert," by forms of *nomen*. But he adapts it to an unprecedented end: his ambition is to be numbered among Thebes' ancestors, along with a mythic *uates*. The adjective *priscus* also recurs in reference to Statius' epic inspiration: *te nostra magistro / Thebais urguebat priscorum exordia uatum* ("with you as my mentor my *Thebaid* pressed close upon the works of ancient bards," *Silu.* 5.3.233–234). Here it similarly suggests the idea of an indefinitely remote past, of an archaic age or the very mythic origins of poetry.

Amphion as Orpheus is a symbol of the magic power of poetry, of its civilizing force, of its social function. Helen Lovatt has shown the importance of the figure of Orpheus and of the concept of *uates* in the *Siluae*, concluding, in rather pessimistic terms, that Statius is in fact a post-Augustan *uates*, failing to fulfill the public role and the political function to which he aspires.[37] I believe that Amphion too is a figure of Statius, but a successful one, an effective symbol for legitimizing the Flavian poet's role in contemporary society, not only as an epic poet, but also as an occasional poet. There is no space here to list all of Amphion's appearances in the works of Statius, but I would like to point out one in particular; in the opening of *Silu.* 3.1, the magic rapidity of Amphion, building the walls of Thebes through song, is also a self-reflexive symbol of Statius' *celeritas* in constructing his poem, his "poetic temple," as Carole Newlands defines it:[38]

> uix oculis animoque fides ...
> o uelox pietas! ...
> ... Tyrione haec moenia plectro
> an Getica uenere lyra? stupet ipse labores
> annus et angusti bis seno limite menses
> longaeuum mirantur opus ...
> '... non Amphioniae steterint uelocius arces
> Pergameusue labor'. (Stat. *Silu.* 3.1.8, 12, 16–19, 115–116)

> Eyes and mind scarce credit it ... O rapid piety! ... Did these walls arrive by Tyrian quill or Getic harp? The year itself is amazed at its labor, the twice six months, so narrowly bounded, marvel at a work built to last ... "... Amphion's towers will not have sited themselves more rapidly, nor the labor of Pergamus."

---

36 Cf. also Ov. *Ars* 3.339–340; *Trist.* 4.10.51–54, and, in a retractation, 5.1.17–20.
37 Lovatt (2007).
38 Newlands (1991).

Statius advertises with particular pride this extempore performance of his, in dedicating the book to Pollius: *nam primum limen eius Hercules Surrentinus aperit, quem in litore tuo consecratum, statim ut uideram, his uersibus adoraui* ("for its threshold is opened by Hercules of Surrentum; as soon as I saw him consecrated on your beach, I paid homage with these verses," *Silu.* 3 *praef.* 8–10). Through his *audacia stili*, the Flavian poet rivals a divinely inspired architect, and equals the mythic Theban bard: one of the very founders of poetry thus offers the most authoritative legitimation to the modern poetics of *impromptu* composition proposed by the *Siluae*.[39]

Statius' overt equation of himself with Amphion in the *Achilleid*'s proem, and his indirect comparison with him in *Siluae* 3.1, prompt us to see even in the mention of the bard at the beginning of the *Thebaid* a self-reflexive image: *quo carmine muris / iusserit Amphion Tyriis accedere montes* ("with what music Amphion bade mountains draw nigh the Tyrian walls," *Theb.* 1.9–10). Inserted as he is as the only positive note in a list of misfortunes, and placed next to Cadmus in a learned allusion to the "double foundation" of Thebes,[40] the mythic *uates* is here an effective icon for the power of poetry, its foundational value, perhaps even its capacity of redeeming a tragic story, rising above the *gemitus et prospera Cadmi* ("the sorrows and happy days of Cadmus", 1.15).

In *Siluae* 3.2, when he invokes the sea gods Leucothea and Palaemon, Statius displays once more his Theban credentials: *tu tamen ante omnes diua cum matre, Palaemon, / adnue, si uestras amor est mihi pandere Thebas / nec cano degeneri Phoebeum Amphiona plectro* ("but above all do you grant your favor, Palaemon, with your goddess mother, if it is my desire to tell of your Thebes and I sing Phoebus' Amphion with no degenerate lyre," *Silu.* 3.2.39–41). This claim to poetic merits exactly recalls the *Thebaid*'s proem, where Ino and Melicertes are glimpsed just before their tragic leap and lucky metamorphosis (*cur non expauerit ingens / Ionium socio casura Palaemone mater*, "wherefore Palaemon's mother did not fear the vast Ionian when she made to plunge in company with her son," *Theb.* 1.13–14). Moreover, by explicitly putting himself in the hereditary line of Amphion, Statius here comments on his own verses (*Theb.* 1.9–10) and confirms his identification with the *uates*, already suggested in the epic proem.

Indeed, Amphion stands as a cameo of the poet on the front page of his major work: a figure of Statius as the Flavian *aoidos*, the mythic bard of a

39 Rosati (2014).
40 See Olivieri (2011) 24–27; cf. *Theb.* 10.786–788.

written book, the enthusiastic poet of an elaborate epic, of *bissenos multum uigilata per annos / Thebai* ("My Thebaid, on whom I have spent twelve wakeful years," *Theb*. 12.811–812), of *Thebais multa cruciata lima* ("*Thebaid*, tortured by much filing", *Silu*. 4.7.26). There is an oxymoronic tension in the poetics of the *Thebaid*, between the epic Callimacheanism of the epilogue and the archaic epic pose of the proem—between the lyre and the file. But precisely this return to the origins is what connects the *Thebaid* with the modern poetics of the *Siluae*—a minor poetics which is, by a paradox, anti-Callimachean.[41] The reversion to the archaic is a jump into the present: into the contemporary culture of performance and improvisation, as it is exemplified by Statius' occasional poetry. By hinting at the mythical beginnings of poetry, and approaching the traditional stylistic moves of a singing poet, the proem of the *Thebaid* suggests a contemporary context of recovered orality—not by chance, the performance marker *tendo chelyn*, "I tune my lyre" (*Theb*. 1.33), is closely linked with the project of a panegyrical epic for Domitian.

It may be interesting to observe, finally, that even the epic narrative proper is not impermeable to the aesthetic of rapidity and wonder which characterizes Statius' occasional poetry: the ekphrasis on Opheltes' funerary monument, which is built in nine days and described in five lines, is almost an essay of the poetics of the *Siluae*, of ecphrastic poetry and seemingly extempore virtuosity, given in the midst of *laboratas … Thebas*, "my toil of Thebes" (*Silu*. 3.2.143).[42] Conversely, while Statius presents the *Siluae* as minor poetry and contrasts it with epic in the *praefatio* to the first book, he brings the *Siluae* close to the *Thebaid* (and the *Achilleid*) through the initial self-portrait as an "inspired" poet, driven by the "heat" (*calor*) of a creative stimulus; *hos libellos, qui mihi subito calore et quadam festinandi uoluptate fluxerunt* ("these little pieces, which streamed from my pen in the heat of the moment, a sort of pleasurable haste," *Silu*. 1 *praef*. 2–4): this is but a humbler version of *Pierius menti calor incidit* (*Theb*. 1.3),[43] and the shared image of an inspired attitude seems to endow even the occasional production with the nobility of enthusiastic poetry in the sublime register.

In a recent piece, Gianpiero Rosati shows how Statius represents himself in the *Siluae* as "striking the pose of an *aoidos*" (*un aedo in posa*), taking upon himself the iconography of *Apollo citharoedus* and ennobling his role

41 Rosati (2014).
42 Cf. *Theb*. 6.242–248. See Mira Seo's suggestion in Micozzi (2009) 223 n. 3.
43 Cf. *Ach*. 1.5 and *Silu*. 3.2.40.

as a professional poet through a religious sanction. The assimilation to the mythic figure of a *uates* is also part, I think, of this self-promotional strategy. I submit that this model of the inspired *uates* singing on the lyre, which is sometimes embodied by Amphion, unites the *Thebaid* and the *Siluae*, generic differences notwithstanding.

2.2. *The Proem to the* Thebaid *and the Poetics of the* Siluae

It is often argued that in the *Siluae* Statius represents himself as the poet of the *Thebaid*, as if to redeem the minor genre with the prestige of his epic work. I believe that, in a sense, the opposite is also true: the two sides of Statius' poetic activity imply and legitimate each other. The proem to the *Thebaid* is a case in point; here the "fiction … of a *performance*," "the illusion of improvisation," seems to superimpose on the archaic model of the epic *aoidos* the contemporary profile of the professional poet, as it is constructed in the *Siluae*: this is suggested by the lyric moves, of an Horatian / Pindaric kind, which overlap with the pattern of rhapsodic interrogation and hesitation.[44]

On the other hand, in the *Siluae*, self-representation as an occasional poet does not appear alternative, but rather complementary to (or even homogeneous with) that as an epic poet—in spite of the difference in level, the traits of continuity prevail, the two forms alternate in a constant osmosis, the inspiring deities take turns but may also change their clothes to serve immediately the different poetic mode (like Clio in *Silu.* 1.5); the lyric song can rise to the sublimity of Pindaric song, just as the epic of the *Thebaid* "consecrates" Thebes in the manner of Pindar (*Silu.* 4.7); and so on. A reciprocal implication of the grand and the small is what Statius' poetics seems to propose throughout.

One detail common to the *Thebaid* and the *Siluae* proves revealing: the image of the lyre, and the terms which designate it, stand as a symbol for poetry in all its expressions, from epic to the occasional poems; this is a use which is peculiar to Statius and seems to define his poetics as a whole as the professional dominion of poetry *tout court*. Whether he "extols the deeds of magnanimous kings" (*magnanimum … facta attollere regum*, *Silu.* 5.3.10) or confers immortality through his ephemeral poems, the Flavian

---

[44] Markus (2003) 443–444: "So, by opening the *Thebaid* with a priamel, Statius associates his composition with publicly performed panegyrical poetry of the Pindaric kind." Also the contact with Homeric passages (e.g., *Od.* 1.5) is revealing.

poet constantly represents himself as a professional with the lyre in hand, always ready and up to his task, able every time to adapt his song to the occasion and the audience—like the Homeric *aoidos*, who possesses all the traditional repertoire but chooses every time where to begin from and in which order to narrate; or like the occasional lyric poet, who modulates his song according to the circumstance (καιρός) and the subject to be praised.

3. *Conclusion*

The *Thebaid* and the *Siluae* appear to be connected by a unitary conception of poetry as a socially prestigious profession, a trade on which authority is conferred by the ennobling comparison with different archetypes of the Greek imagination: the Homeric *aoidos*, the lyric singer in the manner of Pindar, the figures of the mythic *uates*, or the god of poetry himself, Apollo, whose signs and pose Statius, as a priest, takes upon himself.

This complex construction is an audacious mixture of the archaic and the contemporary; historically different experiences of Greek literature, from the *polis* to the court (the mythic / Homeric, archaic or Hellenistic one), seem to be absorbed and integrated into the ecumenical frame of the empire of Rome—and almost into an ecumenical poetics.

Statius is a paradoxical poet. To reconcile the lyre and the file, the poetics of epos and a poetics of *impromptu* composition, the Callimacheanism of the grand epic and the (presumed) anti-Callimacheanism of the minor poetry—even more, to condense all this in his own image—this may seem to be no small challenge: but precisely this paradox is the unmistakable sign of his art.

LIKE PURPLE ON IVORY:
A HOMERIC SIMILE IN STATIUS' *ACHILLEID*

Pavlos Sfyroeras

The proem of the *Achilleid* makes it amply clear: its privileged intertext is Homer's *Iliad*. Yet Statius' professed aim to complement the Greek epic—to fill in the gaps and sing the whole Achilles (*ire per omnem … / heroa*, Stat. *Ach.* 1.4–5; see Bessone in this volume)—and thus to avoid overlap with it may have deterred some scholars, if not from tracing Iliadic allusions in his poem, at least from exploring the specific strategies Statius employs to engage with the epic.[1] I shall focus on one Iliadic detail, namely the famous simile that compares the visual effect of blood on Menelaus' thigh to purple dye staining ivory when a Maeonian or Carian craftswoman adorns a horse's cheek-piece fit for kings (Hom. *Il.* 4.141–147). This simile has a long history in Latin poetry before Statius: Ennius, Catullus, Virgil, and Ovid all succumb to its appeal, placing it almost exclusively in the female sphere. In returning to the Homeric prototype, Statius innovates in two basic ways: first, he does not limit his treatment of the simile to one passage but breaks it up into its constitutive parts, which he scatters across his *Achilleid* to encompass the whole poem. Second, he recognizes in the Iliadic simile the simultaneous presence of feminine and masculine elements, which he restores to create an emblem for his reading of the epic tradition as a whole.

1. *From Homer to Statius*

Let us first consider the Homeric passage, which, oddly, is the sole color simile in the entire *Iliad*:

> ὡς δ᾽ ὅτε τίς τ᾽ ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοίνικι μιήνῃ
> Μῃονὶς ἠὲ Κάειρα, παρήιον ἔμμεναι ἵππων·

---

[1] On Homeric allusions in the *Achilleid*, see Juhnke (1972) 162–172, 371–375; Taisne (2008). On some of the proem's complexities, including the relationship with the *Iliad*, see Heslin (2005) 71–84, as well as Aricò (1996) and Barchiesi (1996). On similes as an element of Statius' poetics, see Sturt (1982).

κεῖται δ' ἐν θαλάμῳ, πολέες τέ μιν ἠρήσαντο
ἱππῆες φορέειν· βασιλῆι δὲ κεῖται ἄγαλμα,
ἀμφότερον κόσμος θ' ἵππῳ ἐλατῆρί τε κῦδος·
τοῖοί τοι, Μενέλαε, μιάνθην αἵματι μηροὶ
εὐφυέες κνῆμαί τε ἰδὲ σφυρὰ κάλ' ὑπένερθε. (Hom. *Il.* 4.141–147)

As when a woman stains ivory with scarlet, some woman of Maeonia or Caria, to make a cheekpiece for horses, and it lies in a treasure chamber, though many horsemen pray to wear it; but it lies there as a king's delight, doubly so, as an ornament for his horse and to its driver a glory; even so, Menelaus, were your thighs stained with blood, your shapely thighs and your legs and your fair ankles beneath.

Among the striking features of the simile, the chromatic contrast serves as the backdrop for a number of polarities: domestic interior and battlefield, artifact and nature, human and animal, but also (and perhaps most significantly for Statius' own reading) female and male. More specifically, while the context (or "target") of the simile is masculine, the content (or "base")—the adornment of the bridle—bridges the worlds of men and women.[2]

Before we move on to Statius, it is worth surveying briefly his Latin predecessors, all of whom—let it be noted in advance—choose to underline the feminine aspects of the Homeric simile. The color contrast at least enters the Roman literary stage with Ennius: *et simul erubuit ceu lacte et purpura mixta* ("and at once [she] blushed, like milk and crimson mingled," Enn. *Ann.* 361 Skutsch). The fragment, which owes its preservation to the archaic nominative *lacte*, raises several questions. Its context eludes us, of course, as does the identity or even the gender of the verb's subject.[3] Furthermore, since it contains no ivory, it need not allude specifically to the Iliadic passage, but may instead activate a distinct literary *topos*, the coexistence of red and white.[4]

---

[2] On the simile, see Kirk (1985) 345–347, who construes "the desirability of the finished royal possession" as "implying the unique value of Menelaos to the Achaeans." Kirk also notes that "ivory is mentioned only twice in the *Iliad* (here and at 5.583), both times of horse-trappings, but eight times, and with a greater range of applications, in the *Odyssey*." Bömer (1976) 117 (on *Met.* 4.332) notes the uniqueness of the color simile ("in dem einzigen Farbvergleich der Ilias"). For the terms "target" and "base," see, e.g., Ben-Porat (1992): they correspond to "tenor" and "vehicle" respectively.

[3] Skutsch (1985) 525–527, sceptical that the fragment belonged to Cato's speech against the repeal of the Lex Oppia (cf. Liv. 34.4.6), mentions the possibility of the Numidian queen Sophonisba or the Chalcidian bride of Antiochus. He even suspects that the correct reading might be dative *lactei*.

[4] A similar color contrast *without ivory* can be found in Greek and Latin texts both before and after Ennius; see Callim. *H.* 5.27–28; *Anacreont.* 16.23; [Bion] 2.17–18 Gow; Aristaenet. 1.1; Musae. 58; Catul. 61.185–188; Prop. 2.3.10–12; [Tib.] 4.31–34; Ov. *Am.* 3.3.5–6 and *Met.* 3.423;

What is beyond doubt, however, is that Ennius' application of the color contrast to blushing will prove fertile in Latin literature. A reason may have been the masterfully iconic construction of the verse: the process of color change in *erubuit* is captured as we shift from the first nominative (*lacte*) to the second (*purpura*), the latter modified by the participle (*mixta*). Although it is not clear on what occasion purple dye might be mixed in milk, the reddening of the milk is a vivid depiction of blushing.

Colors and materials make the Homeric model more transparent in Catullus, despite the absence of a simile *per se*:

> puluinar uero Diuae geniale locatur
> sedibus in mediis, Indo quod dente politum
> tincta tegit roseo conchyli purpura fuco. (Catul. 64.47–49)

> Indeed, there in the midst, the Goddess' bridal
> divan is placed, inlaid with Indian tooth and spread
> with woven purple dipped in rosy murex dye.

In describing the wedding couch of the divine bride, Catullus adopts the Homeric juxtaposition of ivory and purple, found here on bed and coverlet respectively. The purple is no longer a liquid dye applied to an ivory object, but an already dyed (*tincta*) fabric spread on the ivory.

Virgil, now, fuses Homeric imagery with Ennius' application to portray the blush of Lavinia's face, when she hears her mother Amata implore her groom-to-be Turnus not to go into battle:

> accepit uocem lacrimis Lauinia matris
> flagrantis perfusa genas, cui plurimus ignem
> subiecit rubor et calefacta per ora cucurrit.
> Indum sanguineo ueluti uiolaverit ostro
> si quis ebur, aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa
> alba rosa: talis uirgo dabat ore colores. (Virg. *Aen.* 12.64–69)

> Lavinia heard her mother's words, her burning cheeks steeped in tears, while a deep blush kindled its fire, and mantled over her glowing face. As when one stains Indian ivory with crimson dye, or white lilies blush when mingled with many a rose—such hues her maiden features showed.

Following Ennius' innovation, Virgil does away with the open wound and makes the blood subcutaneous. At the same time, he hides it in yet another, parallel fashion: the adjective *sanguineo* ("bloody") is, strictly speaking,

---

Stat. *Silu.* 2.1.41; Claud. *DRP* 1.272. Fedeli (1983) 122–123 describes this color contrast as an epithalamian *topos*.

unnecessary, as its color is conveyed by the noun *ostro* ("purple dye"), which it modifies. Yet it replaces the Homeric noun αἷμα and moves the blood from the "target" to the "base" of the simile.[5]

Also blushing, though from shame (*purpureus ... pudor*) this time, is the lover in Ovid's *Amores* 2.5, when she is reproached for her unfaithfulness:

haec ego, quaeque dolor linguae dictauit; at illi
 conscia purpureus uenit in ora pudor,
quale coloratum Tithoni coniuge caelum
 subrubet, aut sponso uisa puella nouo;
quale rosae fulgent inter sua lilia mixtae,
 aut ubi cantatis Luna laborat equis,
aut quod, ne longis flauescere possit ab annis,
 Maeonis Assyrium femina tinxit ebur.
hic erat aut alicui color ille simillimus horum,
 et numquam uisu pulchrior illa fuit. (Ov. *Am.* 2.5.33–42)

These were my words, and whatever passion dictated to my tongue; but she—her conscious face mantled with ruddy shame, like the sky grown red with the tint of Tithonus' bride, or maid gazed on by her newly betrothed; like roses gleaming among the lilies where they mingle, or the moon in labor with enchanted steeds, or Assyrian ivory Maeonia's daughter tinctures to keep long years from yellowing it. Like one of those, or very like, was the color she displayed, and never was she fairer to look upon.

This series of five short similes culminates with the Maeonian woman dyeing Assyrian ivory, so that it may not turn yellow with age (2.5.39–40). The purple here is only implied, through the girl's blushing (*purpureus*), which makes her even more seductive (*numquam ... pulchrior*), and of course through the Homeric allusion, to which Ovid draws our attention: not only does the last simile comprise a subordinate clause to double the length of the preceding ones, but it also includes the phrase *Maeonis ... femina* to translate verbatim the Iliadic γυνὴ ... Μῃονίς.

Finally, in the *Metamorphoses*, the young Hermaphroditus responds to the advances of the naiad Salmacis with a rosy blush that Ovid compares, almost in passing, to dyed ivory (*ebori tincto*, 432):

[5] The passages in the previous note include precedents for the Virgilian lilies. Lavinia's ivory simile is anticipated in *Aen.* 1.590–592, where Venus' beautification of Aeneas for Dido's sake creates a subtle link between him and Lavinia in books 1 and 12 respectively; while *Aen.* 1 describes a man, it is Venus' art of seduction that is at work. Note that both passages of the *Aeneid* leave the craftsman's gender unspecified.

pueri rubor ora notauit;
nescit, enim, quid amor; sed et erubuisse decebat:
hic color aprica pendentibus arbore pomis
aut ebori tincto est aut sub candore rubenti,
cum frustra resonant aera auxiliaria, lunae. (Ov. *Met.* 4.329–333)

> But the boy blushed rosy red; for he knew not what love is. But still the blush became him well. Such color have apples hanging in sunny orchards, or painted ivory; such has the moon, eclipsed, red under white, when brazen vessels clash vainly for her relief.

As we have noted already, all the Latin passages share a female, indeed erotic, emphasis. The last instance is only a partial exception that proves the rule: the blush appears on a boy's face, to be sure, yet a boy feminized by the gaze of female desire, foreshadowing the blending of male and female by the end of the tale.[6]

2. *Statius' Achilles*

Let us now turn to Statius. The palette of the simile is introduced to coincide with Achilles' very first appearance, as witnessed by Thetis (esp. 161–162):

figit gelidus Nereida pallor:
ille aderat multo sudore et puluere maior
et tamen arma inter festinatosque labores
dulcis adhuc uisu: niueo natat ignis in ore
purpureus fuluoque nitet coma gratior auro. (Stat. *Ach.* 1.158–162)

> Icy pallor rivets the Nereid. The lad was there, much sweat and dust made him bigger, and yet amid weapons and hurried labors he was still sweet to look upon. A crimson glow swims in his snow-white face and his hair shines fairer than tawny gold.

The color contrast, truly unmistakable here, is reinforced by the opposition of fire and snow, hot and cold, already felt in Thetis' *gelidus pallor*, which sets off Achilles' ruddiness. At the same time, it helps focalize our perspective: Thetis turns pale at the sight of what we are also about to see through her own eyes, namely her son whose flushing complexion recalls the hues of the Homeric simile, yet would be more akin to the image of a blushing maiden

---

[6] On the passage and parallels, see Bömer (1976) 117–118. The analogous yet ivory-less application of red and white to Narcissus (*Met.* 3.423) conveys also gender ambiguity, as does the reverse case of Atalanta (*Met.* 10.591–596), in a passage that features also ivory but only on Atalanta's back. A different type of gender ambiguity ensues from the proximity of blood and snowy hands in Catul. 63.7–8.

such as Lavinia in *Aeneid* 12.[7] The femininity momentarily evoked in this image (yet cf. 164) is eclipsed by the appearance of the strapping youth, but it will prove to be at the heart of the poem.

As critics have recognized, this passage is partly modeled on the description of Apollo by "Lygdamus" in the Tibullan corpus:[8]

intonsi crines longa creuice fluebant,
  stillabat Syrio myrtea rore coma.
candor erat, qualem praefert Latonia Luna,
  et color in niueo corpore purpureus,
ut iuueni primum uirgo deducta marito
  inficitur teneras ore rubente genas … ([Tib.] 3.4.27–32)

His unshorn hair streamed the length of his graceful neck;
  His locks dripped with the myrrh of Syrian dew.
His brilliance was such as Latona's Luna displays,
  And crimson the shimmer on his snow-bright limbs,
As a maiden, first escorted to her young husband,
  Blushes, her tender cheeks stained with red …

The relevance of Apollo's appearance is obvious, especially as the passage joins the ephebic god with the bashful bride in its concluding simile. Yet Statius moves a small though crucial step closer to the Homeric prototype, with the strikingly paradoxical, perhaps even unique, collocation of *ignis* and *natat*.[9] This use of the verb, which is without exact parallels, intimates the flow of a liquid, clearly unnecessary in the depiction of a flushed face, but paving the way to both blood and purple dye.

While Statius uses the palette of the Homeric simile to convey feminine charm, he does not take long to evoke it again for its masculine aspects, notably the equine elements, in particular its reference to the construction of bridles.[10] First, in the simile that follows on the heels of his first appear-

---

7 On Statius' technique in introducing Achilles see Heslin (2005) 157–191; Ganiban (2014). On this passage in general, see Heslin (2005) 182–183 and Uccellini (2012) 138–143.

8 See Heslin (2005) 182–183; Ripoll and Soubiran (2008) 178, who cite also *Silu.* 1.2.61 (*cui plurimus ignis ore*, "whose brand had most fire")—a verbal echo of *Aen.* 12—and the obvious Greek model of Achilles among Lycomedes' daughters in [Bion] 2.18–19 Gow. They describe the association of red and white on the face of maidens or effeminate youths as a *topos* of Hellenistic and Neo-Alexandrian poetry.

9 This resembles but outdoes *ora natant* in *Silu.* 2.1.18; compare 2.1.41 (*purpureo suffusus sanguine candor*, "fair complexion, suffused with red of blood"). *Silu.* 2.1 clearly anticipates some aspects of the *Achilleid*. The simile in Prop. 2.3.1–12 uses *natant* more straightforwardly; cf. Fedeli (1983) 122 and Uccellini (2012) 141.

10 With the partial exception of Ov. *Am.* 2.5.38, Statius' Roman predecessors do not employ the equine elements in connection with this simile.

ance, the youth is compared to Castor stepping in the river Eurotas with his panting horse (*anhelo … equo*, Stat. *Ach.* 1.180–181). Given that Achilles is horseless here, the addition of a horse in the simile serves the special purpose of setting the tone for yet another comparison that presents Achilles *himself* as a horse. With this new simile, so crucial for the unfolding of the plot, we are already on Scyros, where Thetis tries to talk Achilles into donning female garb. Achilles responds like a horse resisting his first harness and chafing at the first bit:

> effrenae tumidum uelut igne iuuentae
> si quis equum primis summittere temptet habenis:
> ille diu campis fluuiisque et honore superbo
> gauisus non colla iugo, non aspera praebet
> ora lupis dominique fremit captiuus inire
> imperia atque alios miratur discere cursus. (Stat. *Ach.* 1.277–282)

> As though one were to try to subject a horse, haughty with the fire of unbridled youth, to his first harness; long delighting in field and river and proud beauty, he bends not his neck to the yoke nor his fierce mouth to the bit, loudly indignant to pass captive under a master's command, marveling to learn new courses.

Lacking clear literary precedents, this comparison must surely be invented to serve an important function.[11] First, Statius invites a connection between this equine simile and the image of Achilles' flushed face through his mention of the "fire of youth" (*igne iuuentae* 1.277), which harks back to the earlier *ignis purpureus* (1.161–162). These two passages, taken together, outline more clearly the contours of the Homeric simile.[12] What is only implied in *Iliad* 4, i.e., the use of the bridle, is here fleshed out, to reveal perhaps an underlying analogy. Just as a craftswoman adorns a cheek-piece meant for a king's horse, so Thetis tries to apply a metaphorical harness to tame the colt that is Achilles.

What Thetis fails to do is of course accomplished by the sight of Deidamia, which in a sense becomes the "harness" that subdues the young hero (cf. 1.283–284) and ushers in the most explicit evocation of the Homeric simile. The description of Deidamia, especially her flushed face (*roseo*

[11] Ripoll and Soubiran (2008) 193–194 list the closest models (*Aen.* 11.492–497; *Il.* 6.506–511; Enn. *Ann.* 534–535 Skutsch) and suggest that the simile may be inspired by Achilles' proximity with the Centaur.

[12] The two passages are further linked as they signal important moments in Achilles' interaction with Thetis: the first marks the hero's first appearance, the second his resistance to her disguising attempt.

flammatur purpura uultu, "purple is fired by her rosy face," 1.297), echoes the earlier one of Achilles.[13] The purple burning on her rosy cheeks becomes the fire that, similar to Dido (Virg. *Aen.* 1.749), Achilles drinks (*totisque nouum bibit ossibus ignem*, "and drank novel flame in all his bones," Stat. *Ach.* 1.303) and that, like a torch from within (1.304), brightens his countenance—and here we have the double simile:[14]

> … deriguit totisque nouum bibit ossibus ignem.
> nec latet haustus amor, sed fax uibrata medullis
> in uultus atque ora redit lucemque genarum
> tinguit et impulsam tenui sudore pererrat.
> lactea Massagetae ueluti cum pocula fuscant
> sanguine puniceo uel ebur corrumpitur ostro,
> sic uariis manifesta notis palletque rubetque
> flamma repens. (Stat. *Ach.* 1.303–310)

> … he stiffened and drank novel flame in all his bones. Nor does his draught of love stay hidden; the brand waving in his inmost parts goes to his face and tinges the brightness of his cheeks, wandering over them with a light sweat as they feel the impulse. As when the Massagetae darken their cups of milk with blood or when ivory is tainted with purple dye, such is the sudden fire manifest by various signs, paling and blushing.

The allusion to the Homeric prototype seems, at first sight, to be limited to less than one verse (*puniceo uel ebur corrumpitur ostro*), yet various Iliadic elements come together, albeit artfully re-arranged. First, ivory makes its very first appearance in the *Achilleid*; as in Homer, it is tainted (*corrumpitur*) with purple dye. The choice of the verb *corrumpitur* represents, in fact, a clear nod to Homeric phrasing; it replaces Virgil's *uiolauerit* (*Aen.* 12.67), intended perhaps to render more accurately Homeric μιήνῃ.[15] Rather than a translator's attempt at faithfulness, this change signals an artist's intertextual gesture, alerting us that what we should have in mind is a poet's engagement with Homer.

---

13 Ripoll and Soubiran (2008) 195–197 discuss the analogies in the portraits of the two lovers, which extend to their gender ambivalence: as Achilles is disguised, Deidamia is equated to Minerva (1.299–300), the goddess who is honored.

14 Ripoll and Soubiran (2008) 198–199 describe it as a triple simile because they include *flamma*, but strictly speaking fire is a metaphor outside the simile.

15 Dilke (2009^3) 106–107; Ripoll and Soubiran (2008) 198. Note also how Statius keeps almost intact Virgil's verse structure but plays with it: *sanguineo* becomes *sanguine*, while its slot in the verse is filled by another adjective (*puniceo*) to modify the final word *ostro*. The two verbs also occupy the same position in the verse.

If we do, we can notice that, while blood is the "target" in Homer, here it helps form the first half of the double simile, the mixing of milk and blood;[16] in turn, this recalls Virgil's *Georgics*:

> … Bisaltae quo more solent acerque Gelonus
> cum fugit in Rhodopen atque in deserta Getarum,
> et lac concretum cum sanguine potat equino. (Virg. *G.* 3.461–463)

> … even as the Bisaltae are wont to do, and the keen Gelonian, when he flees to Rhodope and the wilds of the Getae, and there drinks milk curdled with horses' blood.

It also echoes, even more closely, Seneca's *Oedipus*: *lactea Massagetes qui pocula sanguine miscet* ("the Massagetan who mingles blood with cups of milk," *Oed.* 470). We may now start discerning a little more clearly the point of Statius' intertextual play. Achilles' flushed face, in conjunction with the simile, evokes Lavinia's blushing in *Aeneid* 12; against this feminine backdrop, however, Achilles' desire is so intensely masculine that it draws in the fierce warriors who drink milk mixed with blood.

Paradoxically perhaps, this very desire constitutes in fact the horse-bit which ends up taming Achilles. There is no explicit horse-bit, of course, no equine element, unless we recall that the blood mixed with milk in the Gelonian drink comes from a horse. Rather, the simile itself functions as the horse-bit. This paradox—of the masculine desire that feminizes, of the co-presence of masculine and feminine—corresponds to the visual effect of the alternation of red and white (*palletque rubetque*) and produces the ambiguity of gender (*ambiguus sexus*, *Ach.* 1.337) at the core of the *Achilleid*.

The same color contrast is translated into somewhat different terms with the following simile of the fiery bullock and the white heifer (1.313–317), associated with blazing passion (*ardescunt animi*) and snowy whiteness (*niueo candore*) respectively. Rather than united, as in the previous image, in one face, the two opposites are now separated, represented by bullock and heifer: in fact, their polarized occurrence in male and female is the cause for their coexistence on Achilles' face.

That is also the reason why Statius latches on to the Homeric simile: its fusion of masculine and feminine and its implications for his own poetics. In the Homeric simile, a woman's art beautifies an object for a man's world, just as Thetis' device momentarily conceals a masculine urge with feminine

[16] Note the juxtaposition of *sanguine* and *puniceo* (1.308), which creates the momentary impression that noun and adjective belong together; they do not, of course, but the proximity reminds us of the Homeric simile, which brings blood and purple dye together.

art—or rather her feminine art ultimately and unwittingly furthers a masculine urge.[17] It is no accident that at the moment of his transformation, Achilles is compared to wax shaped by fire and the hand of a sculptor: such was the image of the goddess changing her son (1.332–334).[18] In addition to the numerous epic models of this simile, we should not forget the Maeonian artist—less obvious perhaps, yet just as important for Statius' poetics. At the same time, one cannot help thinking of the implications for Statius' poem in its entirety, as an "artifact." I shall return to this point, to suggest that the Homeric simile establishes a blueprint for the *Achilleid* as a whole—an epic produced by feminine art.

It should be clear by now that Statius uses the Homeric simile to create an imagistic web of male and female associations that is coordinated with the familiar color palette. The scattered echoes of the simile can thus be compared to a Wagnerian *leitmotiv*, signaling gender ambiguity and marking moments of either concealment or revelation of Achilles' dual gender. One such passage that only indirectly, or rather mystically, refers to Achilles is the description of Calchas, about to prophesy and reveal the hero's whereabouts (1.514–535). Calchas first shows pallor (*primo pallore*, 1.515), then fiery and bloodshot eyes (*igne genas et sanguine*, 1.516).[19] His countenance thus contains Achilles' androgynous presence (1.533–535). Another instance when ambiguity of gender is painted with similar colors is the celebration of Bacchic ritual (1.605–614): both genders become Achilles (*et sexus pariter decet et mendacia matris*, "his sex and his mother's lies are equally becoming," 1.605), as he puts on Bacchic costume, including "the purple fillets on his flaxen temples" (*purpureis flauentia tempora uittis*, 1.611) that create a similar chromatic juxtaposition. A little later, at the moment of rape, the color palette is the same, as the moon is suffused with red (1.644).[20]

---

17 This is of course at odds with her intention to divert (masculine) epic; cf. Ganiban (2014).

18 On other literary models for this simile, see Ripoll and Soubiran (2008) 201–202 and Uccellini (2012) 227–228. The deities changing a man's appearance include Venus in *Aen.* 1, on which see n. 5 above. On an Ovidian reading, see Hinds (1998) 138–139, who speaks of Pygmalion: interestingly, Galatea's statue is made of ivory but it is likened to wax (Ov. *Met.* 10.282–286)—just like Achilles! On Achilles' transformation as feminization, see Heslin (2005) 125–129.

19 On paleness and inner fire as typical traits in divination scenes, see Ripoll and Soubiran (2008) 224.

20 We may detect here an allusion to Ov. *Am.* 2.5.39, where Luna appears in a series of similes culminating with the Maeonian woman, and where the implied color would not be evident, were it not for the context.

The revelation of Achilles' true gender is preceded by a similar contrast: the shield that tempts him and exposes his disguised masculinity is both shining (*radiantem*, 1.852) and "by chance ruddy with cruel spots of war" (*saeuis et forte rubebat / bellorum maculis*, 1.853–854). What is more, as Achilles sees his image "in gold" on this "reddened" shield, its light reflected on his face, he himself "shudders and blushes" (*horruit erubuitque simul*, 1.866). The brilliance of the shield, whose use as a mirror preserves still a trace of the hero's feminine persona, combines with Achilles' ruddiness to accompany the moment of revelation.

It is not until the opening of book 2 that the hero's femininity is rejected, as Achilles strips the purple cloak from his breast (2.5) to don the new arms—and "shine" in them (*insignem ipsis … armis*, 2.6), in the brightness of the new dawn. While baring the chest is, by itself, a declaration of masculinity, it includes here the gesture of casting off the purple-dyed fabric, which is perhaps meant as the reversal of the earlier fusion; Achilles' assertive gesture undoes the blending of red and white and puts an end to its applicability.[21]

This is indeed demonstrated in the last two occurrences of red in the poem. In response to Ulysses' speech that culminates with the hypothetical scenario of Deidamia's rape by an invader, a deep flush strikes Achilles' face (*ac simul ingens / impulit ora rubor*, 2.84–85), now distinguished by the exclusive presence of red.[22] Erotic desire is now channeled into enthusiasm for war, as was willed by the fates; in fact, Achilles recalls his training at the hands of Chiron, who would wait for him to return "splashed with dark blood" (*si sparsus nigro remearem sanguine*, 2.127). It is no accident, of course, that his education includes instruction on how to check the flow of blood (2.160). In the non-linear narrative of the *Achilleid*, the blood that prompted the Homeric simile is visible once again. It is its color that now marks the fearless warrior Achilles was always meant to be.[23]

---

21 On the gesture of baring the chest, see Ripoll and Soubiran (2008) 280. The color implications in Achilles' sacrifice—the bloody entrails in the white foam (2.16)—may be a little too subtle to notice.

22 This seems most akin to the blushing caused by moral indignation that Achilles exhibits in *Aen.* 2.542, at least as described by Priam to Neoptolemus: Achilles, the only blushing hero in the *Aeneid*, felt shame (*erubuit*) and returned Hector's bloodless body (*exsangue corpus*).

23 It is hard not to think of *Il.* 11.822–848, where Patroclus applies Chiron's lessons to stanch the blood on Eurypylus' thigh; cf. Ripoll and Soubiran (2008) 305. On the coherent design of the *Achilleid* as we now have it, see Heslin (2005) 62–65.

3. *From Simile to Epic*

Statius signals the centrality of the simile for the *Achilleid* by referring in his proem to the Homeric epic as *cantu Maeonio* (1.3–4).[24] The use of the adjective *Maeonius* in Latin poetry, including that of Statius, as synonymous to "Homeric" is not unprecedented.[25] As a result, its appearance here could be easily overlooked, yet I would argue that the term contains more than a simply neutral designation. Enjambed as it is for emphasis, the epithet is re-charged with programmatic significance: by condensing the entire epic into a lexical evocation of the Maeonian passage, Statius encourages us to consider how his re-reading of this one simile encapsulates his own approach to the *Iliad*.

To be sure, it is not my intention to minimize the significance of the *Achilleid*'s multiple intertexts, both Roman (Catullan, Virgilian, Ovidian, Senecan) and Greek (Pindaric, Euripidean, Callimachean), that shape his narrative, however difficult it may be to establish exact parallels of diction.[26] Rather, by looking closely at one simile, I hope to have shown that Statius engages, in an equally serious and systematic way, with the Homeric model. Statius' intimate familiarity with Homer can be inferred, if proof were needed, from *Siluae* 5.3, the *epicedion* for his father.[27] Homeric poetry, after all, constituted an important component of his father's curriculum (*Silu.* 5.3.146–161), who resembled Homer in that he was claimed by various cities (130–132); he also proved "equal" to Homer's hexameters though his ability to produce prose versions (159–160), thus earning the right to converse with the Maeonian shade in Elysium (26). It would seem especially poignant

---

[24] Such programmatic references to Homer, as Heslin (2005) 74–75 argues, must be construed as typical rejections of the traditional epic paradigm. I concur, but I have tried to explore the *specific* overtones that Statius is eager to read into the adjective *Maeonius*.

[25] Hor. *Carm.* 1.6.2 (*Maeonii carminis*), 4.9.5 (*Maeonius Homerus*); Prop. 2.28.29 (*Maeonias heroidas*); Ov. *Am.* 3.9.25 (*Maeoniden*); *Rem.* 373 (*Maeonio pede*); *Tr.* 4.10.22 (*Maeonides*), *Pont.* 3.3.31 (*Maeonio carmine*), 4.12.27 (*Maeoniis chartis*); Stat. *Silu.* 2.1.117 (*Maeonium senem*), 5.3.26 (*Maeonium senem*); Mart. 5.10.8 (*Maeoniden*), 14.183 (*Maeonio carmine*); most of these are listed in Ripoll and Soubiran (2008) 333. After Horace and Propertius, the use is primarily Ovidian. Of these passages, the underlined phrases represent uses of the adjective to refer not to Homer (*Maeonius senex*, *Maeonides* etc) but to Homeric epic / song. Although Horace and Ovid use it with *carmen*, *Ach.* 1.3–4 is the only occurrence with *cantus*.

[26] On these intertexts, see Ripoll and Soupiran (2008) 22–35. On the difficulty of establishing secure dictional parallels, see Soerink in this volume, pp. 171–191.

[27] On *Silu.* 5.3, see McNelis (2002); Gibson (2006); Newlands (2012) 88–90; and Hulls in this volume, pp. 196–199.

indeed if this *epicedion*, which goes so far as to suggest a partial or symbolic identification in the poet's mind between Homer and the elder Statius, were roughly contemporaneous with the inception of Statius' own attempt, in the *Achilleid*, to come to grips with the *Iliad*.[28]

But while emulating his father in re-enacting an analogous intimacy with the *Iliad*, Statius draws, at the same time, on some of the previous Latin appropriations of the simile, especially Virgil, and attempts to outdo them, by expanding its usefulness and applicability.[29] In Statius' hands, the Iliadic passage blows up into little pieces that are scattered throughout, so as to encompass the entire *Achilleid*. Through such sleight-of-hand, Statius gets more mileage out of the simile than other poets composing in Latin, in a manner that would justify his characterization as "un poète grec de langue latine."[30] What is more, by re-introducing the Iliadic blood, Statius frees the simile from the emphatically feminine and erotic sphere in which his Roman predecessors had confined it, thus restoring the Iliadic fusion of masculine and feminine, in a gesture that is emblematic of Statius' re-reading of the *Iliad* as a whole.

This re-reading of the *Iliad* is of course in large measure indebted to Ovid. Just to take an example, *Tristia* 2.371–374 highlights the female and amorous aspects of Homer's epic:

> Ilias ipsa quid est aliud nisi adultera, de qua
> inter amatorem pugna uirumque fuit?
> quid prius est illi flamma Briseidos, utque
> fecerit iratos rapta puella duces? (Ov. *Tr*. 2.371–374)

> The very *Iliad*—what is it but an adulteress about whom her lover and her husband fought? What occurs in it before the flaming passion for Briseis and the feud between the chiefs due to the seizure of the girl?

Ovid has an obvious axe to grind—he protests that he is the sole author of *Amores* to be punished (*Tr*. 2.361–362)—hence his extreme attempt to

[28] For a dating during the late stage of the composition of *Thebaid*, see Gibson (2006) 260–266. For some issues of fatherhood in *Achilleid* and Statius' milieu, see Fantham (1999).

[29] Interestingly, Statius' use of the Homeric simile does not depend on Catullus 64, of which he is, however, aware, since Catul. 64.59 becomes *Ach*. 1.960, the closing verse of the first book; cf. Hinds (1998) 126–127, who also notes that Achilles' song at 1.188–194 includes Thetis' wedding, *maternos toros*—the very couch! I would suggest that Statius' use of Catullus is more subtle and indirect: just as the purple coverlet casts its shadow over the Peleus and Thetis account, so the simile colors the entire *Achilleid*.

[30] Ripoll and Soupiran (2008) 4. On Statius' dual (Greek and Latin) identity, see, e.g., Newlands (2012) 136–159 and Bessone in this volume, pp. 215–233.

eliminate all male aspects of the *Iliad*.[31] While Statius' debt to Ovid cannot be doubted, the Ovidian misprision of the *Iliad* is somewhat qualified in the *Achilleid*. Statius' treatment of the simile implies that he finds in the Homeric epic a synthesis of male and female elements, and that this ambiguity of gender is important not only for the *Achilleid* but also, more generally, for his own redefinition—or rather his restoration—of epic as a mixed genre whose "dialogic" or "hybrid" roots he boldly traces to the *Iliad* itself.[32]

This view of the *Iliad* can be epitomized in the feminine art of the Maeonian woman, which creates an object of beauty for the battlefield but also, quite literally, an aesthetic analogy for bloodshed. What else is the project of Thetis—and by extension of Statius—in the *Achilleid* but an attempt to disguise, at least for a moment, masculine bloodthirstiness with feminine art?[33] More generally, if the *Achilleid* can be imagined as the Maeonian simile writ large, what else is epic—not only the *Achilleid* but the entire tradition as viewed by Statius—but an effort to create an aesthetic artifact that sublimates bloodshed, yet cannot exist without it? Domitian's twin laurels of bards and captains might not, after all, be in such sharp rivalry as Statius pretends to suggest.

[31] See Hinds (2000) 229. Statius' debt to Ovid is rightly the foundation of several important readings of the *Achilleid*, e.g., Rosati (1992) and Hinds (1998).

[32] I concur with Hinds (1998) and (2000) that, in reading his epic predecessors, Statius does not only situate himself in the tradition but also refashions it in the process. We should view Statius, as Hinds (1998) 124 suggests, "not just as the creator of the *Achilleid*, but also as the creator of traditions which he himself calls into being to account for the *Achilleid*-ness of the *Achilleid*." For the notion that Statius exports his own Muse, see Bessone in this volume, pp. 215–233.

[33] Analogous is the ending of *Thebaid*; see Dietrich (1999).

PART IV

SILIUS ITALICUS

HOMERIC RECEPTIONS IN FLAVIAN EPIC: INTERTEXTUAL CHARACTERIZATION IN *PUNICA* 7

Evangelos Karakasis

The seventh book of Silius Italicus' *Punica* begins after a series of significant Carthaginian victories over the Romans had already been the focus of its narrative in the earlier books: the fall of Saguntum, Hannibal's elephant march over the Alps, as well as consecutive major Roman defeats at the Trebia, Ticinus, and Lake Trasimene. It is within this historical setting of the Second Punic War that Silius presents in positive colors Fabius' policy of military *cunctatio*, that is, his dilatory tactics of avoiding battle as a means of triggering a first decisive shift of the historical process in favor of the Romans. These military methods will lead to disobedience on Minucius' part, Fabius' second in command and master of horse (Sil. 7.494–514), but will eventually culminate in the battle of Gerunium (7.565–750), which will provide Fabius with the essential "textual space" in which to develop his epic ἀριστεία. The whole of the narrative appears to be structured through a juxtaposition of the two basic protagonists of the book, namely the Roman Q. Fabius Maximus and the Carthaginian Hannibal, whose epic portraits are drawn via an indirect confrontation or a direct comparison, as clearly emerges already from the introductive lines of the epic narrative (7.1–33).

The aim of the present paper is to investigate the ways in which the above contrast between the two prominent epic figures of the Silian narrative, with the different ideology and distinct values they represent, is not only developed but also strengthened through various allusions and intertexts. Although several intertextual readings of the *Punica* have already been undertaken, the approach proposed here has as its aim to demonstrate that Silius' characterization techniques in book 7, far from simple and direct, occasionally require the parallel and simultaneous reading of various Homeric, Virgilian, Lucanean, and Statian subtexts.[1] The possible historical associations of the various intertexts of the Silian narrative, as well as

[1] Cf. von Albrecht (1964) 166; for the view that Virgil's *Aeneid*, Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile*, and Silius' *Punica* form an epic trilogy, see Boyle and Sullivan (1991) 297–298; Boyle (1993) 12–13; and Tipping (2007) 225.

the way these political undertones may produce meaning in terms of the Domitianic regime, of its ideology, as well as of the largely (sincere or not) pro-Domitian coloring of Silius' historically engaged epic,[2] also form a significant part of the analysis to follow.

1. *Homeric Receptions in* Punica *7*

Silius names not only Ennius (cf. 12.387–419) and Virgil (= Mantua) (cf. 8.593–594) but also Homer, i.e., a further demonstrable source of epic inspiration for the Flavian poet. Homer in particular is mentioned at 13.778–797,[3] where Silius presents Scipio as coming across Homer's shade in the Underworld. Silius pays homage to his eminent epic predecessor, when he has his main Roman hero, Scipio, deplore the lack of a Homeric account for Roman achievements, while he considers Achilles blessed for having secured everlasting fame through the Homeric epic. Homeric allusion in Silius, within the narrative of the seventh book, is largely distinguished into two basic categories: first, individual comparisons with Homeric heroes, such as that of Fabius with Nestor, at the period of the latter's second youth, as both are of a similar age (by 217 BCE, Fabius was in his late fifties,[4] cf. Sil. 7.3–4 and 9), acumen, and military strength (7.596–597; see also C. Laelius at Sil. 15.455–456), or that of Hannibal with Achilles (7.113–122).[5] Second, wider intertextual references to integrated episodes of the epic cycle, such as Silius' adoption of the narrative frame and details of the Homeric *Doloneia*, in an effort to portray the distress of the Punic leader through his discussion with his brother Mago, and their night-time assault against the Roman defense force (7.282–380).

As becomes evident from the above, in book 7, both Fabius and Hannibal are compared to Homeric figures of the united Greek forces against the Trojan army. In consequence, character opposition between these two historical figures does not result, on the level of Homeric intertextual allu-

---

[2] *Pace* Wilson (2013) 13–27 who questions a historicist reading of the *Punica* as a Flavian discourse. I am also not convinced by the (so-called) "pessimistic" readings of the poem as an anti-Flavian discourse; for a concise account of optimism vs. pessimism in Silian poetry, see especially Marks (2005) 245–252 and Augoustakis (2010b) 19–20.

[3] See Manuwald (2007) 71–90; Augoustakis (2012a) 145; and Van der Keur in this volume, pp. 287–304.

[4] See Marks (2005) 23–24 and Littlewood (2011) 36–37, 219, but also 139 (Sil. 7.306–307).

[5] See Hardie (1993) 9; Ripoll (2001) 90–93 and (2003) 661–662; Schrijvers (2006) 109; Klaassen (2010) 102 and n. 11; Fucecchi (2010) 228.

sion, simply and relatively easily, i.e., via their correlation with characters belonging to rival camps. In other words, within the seventh book, as in the whole of the Silian epic narrative, it is not only the Carthaginians that are linked to Homeric Greek figures, enemies of the Trojans and, accordingly, of their descendants in a sense (as is, e.g., Hannibal [8.240–241], who foreshadows his victory against the *Aeneadae* by associating himself with Diomedes, a victorious Greek fighter against Troy);[6] it is also the (victorious) Romans who equally resort to such associations with (also victorious) figures of the Greek camp (Scipio, the Roman hero par excellence of the second part of the *Punica*, for example, is in the thirteenth book, chiefly through his *katabasis*, related not only to Aeneas but also to Odysseus). The negative depiction of the one of the two opponents, namely of the Carthaginians, as expected in this particular case of an epic of clear Roman perspective, occurs through the simultaneous reference to intertexts mainly from the *Aeneid*, but secondarily from Virgil's *Georgics*, Lucan, and Statius as well. The Homeric intertexts, in other words, are supplemented with Virgilian, Lucanean, and Statian "footnotes," helping decisively in the production of meaning and thus contributing to the ideological decoding of the Silian text.

2. *Individual Comparisons*

Hannibal, for example, is compared to Achilles in the seventh book; furious at being maneuvered by Fabius' *cunctatio*, Hannibal is presented in 7.116–122 as shaking his hand, brandishing his spear, and hurling taunts against the Roman army. In terms of this traditionally epic (both Homeric and Virgilian) frenzy, Hannibal is linked to a fierce Achilles wielding his arms and shield; this epic bravado (a) and his contemptuous attitude towards an elder figure (b), Fabius in this instance, whom the Carthaginian threatens to kill (*quot demere noster huic annos Fabio gladius ualet!* "but how few years can my sword cut off from the life of this Fabius!" 7.113–114), bring Hannibal close not to Achilles of the last Iliadic book and his respectful reception of Priam but, as already convincingly pointed out by Joy Littlewood,[7] to Priam's slaughter at Pyrrhus' / Neoptolemus', i.e., Achilles' son's, hands (Virg. *Aen.* 2.533–558) and the latter's disrespectful attitude towards the elderly Trojan king. Thus

---

6 See also Tipping (2010a) 80.

7 Littlewood (2011) 77–79. I must make clear here that I am particularly indebted to, and informed by, Littlewood's influential commentary on *Punica* 7, cited throughout this chapter.

Silius also alludes, although in terms of an *oppositio in imitando*, to the Iliadic image of the considerate young Achilles in front of an elder opponent of his[8] (Silian Hannibal = Virgilian Pyrrhus = Homeric Achilles). On the other hand, Hannibal's infuriated Achillean behavior also evokes Turnus when faced with Aeneas' adversary forces,[9] i.e., at the crucial point when Turnus displays *furor*, a negatively colored disposition within the Virgilian epic value system (Virg. *Aen.* 9.756–777, 11.901): Turnus' strong passion leads him to massacre (thus Silian Hannibal = Virgilian Turnus = Homeric Achilles). This association of Hannibal with Turnus is further suggested by the image of the menacing wolf, to which both epic figures are likened (Sil. 7.126–130; see also 7.213 ~ Virg. *Aen.* 9.64 and 7.717–722 ~ Virg. *Aen.* 9.59).[10] Therefore, the qualities Hannibal is presented to share with the Homeric hero (his excessive *saeuitia* and the way this cruelty is depicted in the narrative) at the same time associate the Carthaginian general with negatively portrayed figures of the *Aeneid* (a disrespectful Neoptolemus and a frenzied Turnus), in their direct or indirect comparison with the central hero, the commander of the Romans, Aeneas.

What is more, it is crucially Turnus, *saeuus* against Pandarus, who, like Hannibal, is also overtly and explicitly likened to the epic model of an *alius Achilles* (Virg. *Aen.* 9.717–755), that is, within an episode, which also recalls, in its turn, Neoptolemus' intratextual brutality against Priam (*hic etiam inuentum Priamo narrabis Achillem*, "you will tell Priam that here too an Achilles has been found," 9.742).[11] One should, however, note here that in several instances Hannibal is intertextually linked not only with Turnus but with Aeneas as well, in terms of a quite complex network of alternating intertextual allusions;[12] but in most instances the very similarities discerned point at same time to the changed circumstances in Hannibal's case and, accordingly, often mark him again as an anti-Aeneas, a "Gegenbild zu Aeneas"[13] or, in any case, associate the Silian protagonist with "less positive" illustrations of Aeneas' epic endeavors.

---

8 Cf. Austin (1964) 208–209.

9 See Littlewood (2011) xxix and 79; cf. also Baier (2011) 293.

10 See Ruperti (1795–1798) 1.477; Spaltenstein (1986) 452; Klaassen (2010) 102 and n. 8; Littlewood (2011) 80–81 and 108. For a general association of Hannibal with Turnus, see also Kißel (1979) 108–111; Marks (2005) 196 and n. 85; Fernandelli (2006) 94; Tipping (2010a) 83.

11 See Hardie (1994) 214, 231–232; cf. also *Aen.* 6.89–90. See also Vessey (1982) 322; Ripoll (2001) 92; Littlewood (2011) 155 on Sil. 7.376 (Hannibal) ~ Virg. *Aen.* 12.327 (Turnus).

12 See Tipping (2010a) 83; cf. also Klaassen (2010) 103.

13 von Albrecht (1964) 177. See also Vessey (1975) 401; Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2511; Klaassen (2010) 99–101.

This disrespectful attitude towards an older opponent brings Hannibal close to Lucan's Caesar (cf. Luc. 1.129–130, 324–325) as well and the way the latter accuses Pompey of senility[14] (Silian Hannibal = Lucanean Caesar = (the reverse of) Homeric Achilles). This association of Hannibal with Lucan's Caesar, also in turn frequently re-contextualized, as is the case of the Silian Hannibal in question, as both an irate Homeric Achilles (cf. Luc. 1.143–147, 359–362) and a negatively depicted Virgilian Turnus (cf. Luc. 1.205–212 ~ Virg. *Aen.* 12.4–8),[15] seems to develop into a characterization pattern within the seventh book as well (see pp. 261–262 below) and may also be viewed as a Silian means for intertextually denigrating the Carthaginian leader. Silius seems to be purposefully and cumulatively calling to the audience's mind negatively depicted epic models from Virgil and Lucan, i.e., from his main Roman epic predecessors, despite a likely difference of authorial perspectives, with Lucan being pro-republican to a certain degree, whereas Virgil and Silius are pro-imperial authors (see pp. 252 n. 2 and 260–262).

Conversely, Fabius' positive re-appropriation of Nestor's assets is not deconstructed through Virgilian and Lucanean parallel intertextual references of non-agreeable connotations. On the contrary, an intertextual association of the Silian Nestor-like Fabius (*qualis post iuuenem*, nondum *subeunte senecta, / rector erat* Pylius *bellis* aetate secunda, "thus the king of Pylos fought in his second stage of life, when youth was gone and old age not yet come," 7.596–597) with Nestor as described at Stat. *Theb.* 4.126–127 (nondum *nota* Pylos *iuuenisque* aetate secunda / *Nestor*, "not yet is Pylos famous, Nestor is still young in his second period")[16] gives an intertextual credit to the Silian *Cunctator*, if, of course, one reads here a Silian allusion to Statius and not vice versa; Fabius is crucially intertextually linked with a Nestor praised by Statius for not accepting to join the troops of an army assaulting Thebes and thus materializing the evils, negatively depicted by the poet, of brotherly strife and (Roman) civil war[17] (Silian Nestor = Statian Nestor = Homeric Nestor).

---

14 See Littlewood (2011) 77; cf. also Green (2010) 159.

15 See Roche (2009) 20, 23; cf. also Hardie (1993) 62.

16 See Spaltenstein (1986) 486; Ripoll (2001) 90; Littlewood (2011) xxx. There is now conclusive evidence that, although contemporaries, Silius and Statius occasionally indulge in "cross-references" to each other. See especially Lovatt (2010) 155–178; Littlewood (2011) lvi–lix; and Soerink (2013) 361–377 (with further bibliography).

17 See Vessey (1973) 198–199; cf. also Parkes (2012) 109: "Statius is surely looking back to the Homeric text to stress the absence of Nestor and hence the impiety of this war."

3. *Integrated Episodes: Doloneia*

A number of narrative details and basic patterns of the *Doloneia* have long been convincingly read as direct influence on the Carthaginians' night raid episode in the *Punica*:[18] the contextual setting of a calm night as the background against which the concern of the head of the camp (Agamemnon vs. Hector and Hannibal vs. Fabius respectively), wakeful on account of major worries, is being unfolded (namely fear of military defeat and, accordingly, failure to ensure the armies' welfare); the discussion of the military leader (Agamemnon and Hannibal again) with his younger brother (Menelaus and Mago respectively) and their consecutive common effort to overcome some impasse of strategy; the picture of a leading military figure resting outdoors with his arms in his grasp (Diomedes and Mago); the image of the sleeping warriors (the Homeric Diomedes and various soldiers of Mago's in the Silian episode, for instance) woken up by a leading member of camp with a kick (Nestor in Homer, Mago in Silius); surprise armed enterprises at the duration of the night; warriors dozing on their shields and keeping their arms to hand (Diomedes' men and the Silian Maraxes); the intensely symbolic character of specific animals (Rhesus' horses, Roman oxen);[19] the way basic protagonists attire themselves and their epic equipment (Agamemnon's and Hannibal's lion skin over their shoulders for protection against the chill of the night, the speckled leopard skin of Menelaus and Dolon's wolf skin, for example). All these elements constitute basic motifs that the two narratives, the Homeric *Doloneia* and the Silian episode of the burning of the Roman oxen, share in common.

This initial (positive) association, however, of the Carthaginian characters with figures of the Greek camp, sleepless on account of epic military concerns, is yet again invalidated by way of a Virgilian, Lucanean, and Statian intertextual infiltration of the narrative; the burning of the cattle (7.351–366), that is of 2,000 Roman plow oxen, an incident framed, as mentioned above, by the narrative outline of the tenth book of the *Iliad* is, in addition, described by means of various terms calling to mind the second book of the *Aeneid*. Encircled in the Campanian low hills and faced with the problem of his army's slow starvation, Hannibal devises a rescue scheme, namely to set fire to the animals' bundles of light brushwood and dry branches, placed on

[18] See especially Ruperti (1795–1798) 1.493; Juhnke (1972) 204–207; Spaltenstein (1986) 466; Littlewood (2011) xxx, 131–153 and (2013b) 282–288.

[19] See Littlewood (2013b) 287.

purpose among the oxen's horns. As a result of the image of a remarkable *locus horridus*,[20] so common from the Neronian literature onwards, namely inflamed beasts madly running through the mountains, the Roman sentries are taken aback, and thus the Carthaginian forces manage to get through a narrow pass of the Mount Callicula from the *ager Falernus* to the open area of the upper Volturnus valley in August 217 BCE (cf. also Liv. 22.16–17). A significant detail of the specific segment of the Silian narrative (7.364–366) brings it, as already convincingly pointed out by Littlewood,[21] close to the Virgilian account of the sack of Troy by the Greeks in the second book of the *Aeneid* (*Aen.* 2.307–308): a shepherd is, in both cases, presented as taking notice of the calamitous scene to which the burning of (the Silian oxen, Virgil's Troy respectively) is likened—in the Virgilian instance the figure of the shepherd is importantly yet again associated with the archetypical Roman commander, Aeneas.[22] The Carthaginians are thus once again intertextually connected with negatively depicted figures, in terms of the Roman perspective of the *Aeneid* of course, namely those perpetrating the destruction of Rome's *alma mater*, and, crucially, at the moment this ruin is being accomplished. The anonymous Roman shepherd of the Silian narrative is, on the other hand, identified with Aeneas-herdsman of the Virgilian account, in shock because of a dreadful and calamitous blazing spectacle.

A reading of the Silian episode through Nisus' and Euryalus' Virgilian story of a night raid through the Rutulian camp, as described in the ninth book of the Virgilian epic, may also be read as adding to the intertextual opposition of the two main epic figures of book 7. The Virgilian incident is, in turn, a reworking of the Iliadic *Doloneia*[23] and, what is more, has also been persuasively viewed as a model of the similar narrative part of the *Punica*.[24] The connection is yet again achieved through various linguistic reminiscences as well as through a variety of resemblances on the level of the narrative layout (a nocturnal attack, correspondence in significant garments—Hannibal's and Nisus' lion skin) that two epic narratives share.[25] The impious

---

[20] See Littlewood (2013b) 281.

[21] Littlewood (2011) 152–153 and xxxvii–xxxviii.

[22] Cf. a further significant association of Fabius with Aeneas in their common role as Rome's rescuer at Sil. 7.11; see also Sil. 7.19 ~ Virg. *Aen.* 3.169, 8.59, 10.241; Sil. 7.563 ~ *Aen.* 2.56; Sil. 7.705–706 ~ *Aen.* 12.898 with Littlewood (2011) 41, 43, 160, 211–212, 237.

[23] See Hardie (1994) 9 and 29.

[24] See Ruperti (1795–1798) 1.493; Littlewood (2011) 140 and (2013b) 288–289.

[25] See Littlewood (2011) xx, xxx–xxxi, 108, 110, 129, 133. Cf. also Sil. 7.376 (Hannibal) ~ Virg. *Aen.* 5.319 (Nisus); see Spaltenstein (1986) 461 and Littlewood (2011) 155.

Hannibal is now identified with Euryalus exhibiting excess in his desire to win spoils and a conceited Nisus overstepping boundaries, lacking *pietas* towards his country when privileging personal feelings,[26] and thus about to lose his life (Silian Hannibal = Virgilian "impious" Nisus and Euryalus = Homeric Achaean leaders), whereas Fabius adopts the military tactics of the Latins, when blocking his Punic enemies. Thus it is now Turnus' followers who are associated with the Roman Fabius, while Aeneas' allies, mainly because of the inexperience of their young age,[27] are related through their fatal drawbacks of character and flaws of strategy to the Carthaginian leaders (only in terms of this specific episode of the *Aeneid* though).[28]

Negative associations for the Carthaginians may also be insinuated by a further epic passage, also modeled on both the Homeric *Doloneia* and (self-reflexively, cf. Stat. *Theb.* 10.445–448) on the Nisus-Euryalus Virgilian episode: the night foray of Hopleus and Dymas, who aim at recovering the dead bodies of their masters, Tydeus and Parthenopaeus in *Theb.* 10.347–448.[29] This particular framing of the Statian episode brings it closer to the Silian event, also fashioned after the *Doloneia* and the Nisus-Euryalus story.[30] Despite the epic piety exhibited by both figures of Statius' narrative,[31] the *fata* eventually account for their unaccomplished mission: piety does not always matter in the value system of Statius' epic world of the *Thebaid* (cf. especially 11.457–458); thus Hopleus' and Dymas' assignment proves a failure and, as Randall Ganiban aptly points out, "a resounding statement of … utter futility"[32] (Silian Hannibal = Statian doomed Hopleus and Dymas = Virgilian fated Nisus and Euryalus = Homeric Achaean leaders). A further Statian intertextual association with the Silian episode comes from the incident of the Argives' attack against the Thebans at the beginning of *Thebaid*'s

[26] See Hardie (1994) 26–27 and Littlewood (2013b) 288–289.

[27] See Hardie (1994) 15.

[28] Nisus and Euryalus, however, have also been viewed as the epic icons of Hirtius and Pansa (see Lee [1979] 111), whose death was thought to be a scheme of Octavian's, for both consuls were, to a certain degree, considered as standing in Octavian's way (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.10.2; Suet. *Aug.* 11; Dio Cass. 46.39; see also Ash (2010) 122, 130). If so, Hannibal's intertextual models are hereby crucially associated with alleged "enemies" of the *princeps*.

[29] See Juhnke (1972) 146; Markus (1997) 57; Hinds (1998) 92; Ripoll (1998) 403–404; Ganiban (2007) 3 and n. 14 (with further bibliography), 131–136.

[30] See Littlewood (2011) lvii–lviii.

[31] See Markus (1997) 58–60.

[32] Ganiban (2007) 133. Cf. also Markus (1997) 58. Littlewood (2013b) 279–296 compellingly argues for Hannibal's night raid in *Pun.* 7 as a Silian transformation of the Statian pious, yet unsuccessful, incident into an impious, yet successful, Carthaginian enterprise.

tenth book; in response to the prayer of the Argive women, Juno sends Iris to the abode of Sleep with a view to letting him know of her willingness to trap the Thebans with slumber.[33] As a result, captured by a negatively depicted *furor* (*Theb*. 10.166–167; see also p. 254 above), Thiodamas and his men slaughter, in a demonstrably non-heroic way, the sleeping Thebans, unable to counterattack, and thus engage in a massacre, succinctly described by D.W.T.C. Vessey as "the most horrific and nauseating account of slaughter in the *Thebaid*."[34] However, this night raid of the Argive forces is yet again modeled, although only in part, on the Homeric *Doloneia*,[35] and thus Hannibal is linked with an Argive leader displaying non-heroic cruelty and defying epic values.

The parallel testimony of the third book of the *Georgics*, one more intertext of the Silian episode in question,[36] further emphasizes Hannibal's and his forces' "negative presentation," from the perspective of an informed reader. The cruel spectacle of the burning of cattle is deliberately described in all its horror. The fire eating up the oxen's flesh, igniting their heads and suffocating their lungs, seems to be associated, as Littlewood has persuasively argued,[37] with the feverish *ignis* and its side effects, the plague which befell the animals (cattle and horses) at Noricum, causing respiration problems and blocked or bleeding nostrils, i.e., the very disease Virgil negatively depicts at the end of the third *Georgic* (cf. Virg. *G*. 3.482–483 and 566). If E.L. Harrison is right in reading the plague as a form of punishment against a ritual error, as resulting, in other words, from heavenly anger,[38] it is not a coincidence that such an intertext, dealing with impiety and its castigation, is associated in the Silian narrative with the demonstrably impious (for the Roman mind at least)[39] branding of the flock on Hannibal's part, thus also stressing his moral wickedness. The Carthaginians in general, as well as Hannibal in particular as their representative, their "synecdochic hero" (to use P. Hardie's term), are once again linked to a situation of negative consequences, as evidenced in this case not from the Virgil's epic but from his didactic oeuvre. Hannibal is thus associated with models either lacking epic

33 See also Littlewood (2013b) 280 and Sacerdoti in this volume, pp. 13–29.

34 Vessey (1973) 306.

35 See Juhnke (1972) 144–147.

36 See Littlewood (2011) xxxviii–xliv, 149–151.

37 Littlewood (2011) 149, 151 and (2013b) 281.

38 Harrison (1979) 1–65. Cf., however, the reservations of Thomas (1988) 2.137–138; Mynors (1994) 251; Gale (2000) 77; see also Nappa (2005) 154–155 and Kronenberg (2009) 165.

39 See Littlewood (2013b) 281.

(Nisus and Euryalus, Cacus, Turnus) or georgic piety or availing themselves of ineffectual epic piety, not assimilated by the value system of an epigonal epos (Hopleus and Dymas). From a political perspective, Hannibal becomes associated with situations damaging to agricultural bliss obtainable through georgic *labor*, a Golden Age in Italy as promoted by Augustan ideology, if one accepts an optimistic reading of the *Georgics*.[40] What is more, the undertones of impiety and religious transgression, implicated in the georgic intertext in question, associate Hannibal with religious wickedness, thus opposing the ideal of moral and religious restoration as endorsed by Flavian imperial ideology.[41]

From this perspective, one could also easily agree with Littlewood that Fabius may, on the other hand, be plausibly read here as a Silian incarnation of the Virgilian Hercules in Evander's embedded Cacus-tale of *Aeneid* 8; the descent of the gens *Fabia* from Hercules and Evander seems to be further supporting the associations in question.[42] Hercules here comes to grips with another epic destroyer of cattle, namely an impious Cacus,[43] whose associations with fire both as a primitive Italian fire-deity and in his Virgilian role as the fire-breathing son of Vulcan[44] further point to his intertextual connection with Hannibal as the inventor of the arson stratagem in the Silian episode. Furthermore, Cacus has been plausibly read, in terms of Virgilian epic ideology, characterization, and narrative structure, as a protoepic "double" of Turnus, both of them functioning as instruments of dark chthonic powers, in opposition to Hercules and Aeneas.[45] Hannibal's association with Turnus is thus further brought up by means of his affinities with Cacus, also fashioned after Turnus' character traits. This connection of the great enemy of Rome, Hannibal, with Cacus may also be due to the fact that this Virgilian *monstrum* (*Aen.* 8.198), just like Turnus,[46] has reasonably been read as a conscious symbolism on Virgil's part of another legendary enemy

---

40 I.e., a fashionable reading of Virgilian *didaxis*, which is now again more in vogue than the (so-called) Harvard pessimistic school of thought. See Volk (2008) 7.

41 See Marks (2005) 246–247.

42 Littlewood (2011) xl–xli, xliv, 130 and (2013b) 287–288, 295. See also Littlewood (2011) 243 plausibly associating Fabius' hasty appearance in the combat zone with Hercules' advent to Evander's territory at Virg. *Aen.* 8.200–204, 151, 244–246. Cf. also Fucecchi (2010) 224–227; Tipping (2010a) 116; Cowan (2013) 230 convincingly linking Hercules with Fabius as a "virtual *katabates* at Gerunium." For Silius' Hannibal as an "anti-Herculean figure" in general, see especially Marks (2010b) 29–36, with further bibliography.

43 See Galinsky (1990) 288.

44 See Gransden (1976) 107.

45 See Galinsky (1990) 290; cf. also Hardie (1998) 93.

46 See, e.g., Smith (2005) 220.

of Rome, Mark Antony (with Cleopatra) against Octavian.[47] Hercules, on the other hand, often acting as a model for both Aeneas / Octavian[48] and Domitian, who largely constructs his public image as an icon of Hercules (cf., e.g., Stat. *Silu.* 4.2.50–51, 4.3.154–157; Mart. 5.65),[49] is here linked with the Roman *Cunctator*.

Intertextual characterization seems to be achieved not only through the medium of Virgilian subtexts (see pp. 253–254 and 256–261 above); there is evidence that Silius manages to set up an opposition between his heroes—from a narratological point of view at least—via a complex range of Homeric intertexts through the medium of the rest of post-Virgilian Roman epic poetry, Statius and Valerius Flaccus, but chiefly Lucan. Thus the image of the scorching torches and wandering fires, for example, recalling the Silian oxen incident, has also been associated with Caesar's departure from Ariminum against Rome, resulting to the magistrates' abandonment of the city (Luc. 1.493–498).[50] Fire-brands setting the houses ablaze are thus imagined as accounting for the haste evacuation of the city in a Bacchic frenzy, within an incident also modeled, in turn, on the Virgilian sack of Troy.[51] Fabius, on the other hand, is in *Punica* 7 linked mainly to Lucan's Cato, a figure portrayed in a positive way within the *Bellum Ciuile*, i.e., as an exemplary incarnation of Stoic virtue,[52] or Pompey's *sacrum caput* (cf. Sil. 7.19 ~ Luc. 8.677),[53] as opposed to the greedy, merciless, impious, and unscrupulous Lucanean Caesar,[54] with whom the Silian Hannibal is crucially associated, chiefly in the first half of the poem and in *Punica* 7, in particular,[55] although towards

47 See Hardie (1998) 93 and n. 167 for further bibliography.

48 See Hardie (1998) 83 and n. 127 for further bibliography; cf. also Morgan (1998) 176.

49 See Marks (2005) 222–223; cf. also Zecchini (2011) 35.

50 Littlewood (2011) 150.

51 See Roche (2009) 300–301.

52 Cf. Sil. 7.252 (Fabius' speech to the army) ~ Luc. 2.315; Sil. 7.536–565 (Fabius converses with his son) ~ Luc. 2.234–325 (Cato converses at night with Brutus, also a republican).

53 Cf. Sil. 7.398–400 (Fabius' speech to Minucius) ~ Luc. 5.732–733 (a congenial Pompey in love protects his wife Cornelia vs. a hubristic Caesar during the sea-storm).

54 See, e.g., Braund (2009) xxvi on Lucan's Caesar as an "anti-hero." Despite Lucan's occasional sympathetic attitude towards Caesar, Bartsch (1997) is quite convincing concerning the Neronian author's "intense and impassioned commitment to Pompey" (Braund [2010] 10); for an account of the compelling, in my view, pro-republican reading of Lucan's epic, i.e., the so-called "republic strikes back" approach and some criticism of it, see O'Hara (2007) 136–138 and Braund (2010) 9.

55 Cf. Sil. 7.70–72 (Hannibal vs. Cilnius) ~ Luc. 2.511–512 (Caesar vs. Domitius Ahenobarbus at Corfinium); Sil. 7.116 (infuriated Hannibal) ~ Luc. 1.228 (a less sympathetic Caesar vs. Pompey, as the invader of Ariminum); Sil. 7.401 (a lionine simile for Hannibal) ~ Luc. 1.205–212 (Caesar crossing the Rubicon like a lion).

the end of the Silian historical epic Hannibal is mostly linked to a defeated Pompey.[56] One should also not forget that Lucan's Caesar significantly likens himself to Hannibal already in the first book of the *Bellum Ciuile* (Luc. 1.303–305).[57]

What is more, just as the Virgilian models of Hannibal may plausibly be read as epic symbolisms of various historical enemies of the *princeps* (Augustus), whom Aeneas, up to a point, incarnates, Caesar in Lucan is in a similar way presented as a rival of the *princeps*' own ancestor, i.e., Domitius Ahenobarbus, Pompey's general, who is eventually spared by Lucan's Caesar in the Neronian epic (Luc. 2.478–525). This association of Hannibal with Caesar is, to a certain degree, further suggested by the Virgilian intertext of Sil. 7.113–114, i.e., Hannibal's re-appropriation of Pyrrhus' / Neoptolemus' epic manners; Hannibal is in these lines linked with Achilles' son, i.e., the murderer of Priam. Virgil's Priam here has, however, been viewed as a symbolism of the decapitated Pompey (cf. Serv. ad *Aen.* 2.557). Moreover, these Virgilian lines also function as the model for Lucan's fashioning of Pompey's death (Luc. 8.663–711), when a beheaded Pompey is also presented as an *alius Priamus*.[58] Such a political reading yet again associates Hannibal / Pyrrhus with Pompey's opponent, although Caesar is not himself the perpetrator of Magnus' murder. Hannibal's / Caesar's intertextual linkage with Agamemnon of the *Doloneia* seems to function as a Flavian inversion of the well-known association of Pompey with the Achaean leader, originating, in all probability, from the period between 62 and 55 BCE, when the performance of Accius' *Clytemnestra* and Naevius' or Livius Andronicus' *Equus Troianus* at the opening of Pompey's theater was perceived as an allusion to Pompey's military success. Conversely, Caesar was pictured by Pompey as Aegisthus, because of Caesar's adulterous liaison with Magnus' wife, Mucia, during the latter's absence in Asia (late 62 BCE; Suet. *Jul.* 50.1). Such a connection was quite widespread as also testified by Domitius Ahenobarbus' designation of Pompey as "Agamemnon" and "King of Kings" (cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 67.3 and *Caes.* 41.2; Dio Cass. 42.5.3–5).[59] Furthermore,

---

56 See Marks (2010a) 134–135, 146–147 and nn. 52–53, 148–149 and n. 58; Littlewood (2011) lii, 43, 62, 77, 121, 125–126, 161–162, 208. Cf. also von Albrecht (1964) 54–55; Kißel (1979) 108–111; Brouwers (1982) 82–84; Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2511–2517; Fucecchi (1990) 157–166; Bernstein (2008) 135; Marks (2008) 81–83 and (2010a) 127–153; Tipping (2007) 225 and n. 22, (2010a) 83–92 and 136.

57 See Kißel (1979) 111 and n. 32; Vessey (1982) 327; Littlewood (2011) lii; cf. also Cic. *Att.* 7.11.1 and Roche (2009) 248.

58 See Hinds (1998) 8–10 and Green (2010) 178.

59 See Bartsch (1997) 181; Champlin (2003) 297–303; Erasmo (2004) 83–91.

Silian Hannibal's intertextual liaison with both a Homeric Agamemnon and a Lucanean Caesar also reverses the common Lucanean icon of Pompey as the leader of the Achaeans opposing Caesar, who is re-contextualized as a new Achilles.[60]

As becomes evident from the above analysis, Hannibal functions as the intertextual symbolic icon of the prince's opponents (of Augustus and Nero in particular). This may be significant as far as the construction of Domitian's public image is concerned; for the emperor notably emerges as a "New Augustus,"[61] imitates Nero's image as well as the latter's artistic endeavors (in opposition to Vespasian),[62] and, finally, adopts the "Julio-Claudian portraiture."[63] Hannibal, the legendary enemy of Rome, is thus presented as also opposing the Augustan ideal which, however, the divine Domitian significantly embraces. Hence Hannibal comes out not only as a foe of Rome but also as an opponent of the emperor Domitian / Augustus, whereas Fabius is depicted with clear Domitianic qualities (e.g., Herculean imagery). The ruin of the Falernian vineyards (cf. Sil. 7.157–211), under the protection of Bacchus, who is, in addition, modeled on Hercules of the Virgilian Cacus story,[64] further accounts for the representation of the Carthaginian destroyer of vines as an enemy of the emperor. Domitian is closely associated, as is also the case with Augustus (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6.801–805; Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.9–16),[65] not only with Hercules, whom Hannibal opposes by being an adversary of Fabius, but also with Bacchus (cf. Sil. 3.614–615; Stat. *Silu.* 4.3.153–157; Mart. 8.26.5–8).[66] Statian intertexts of the Silian episode associate Hannibal and the Carthaginians with the Argives (see pp. 258–259 above) and as such also offer valuable insights in terms of a historicizing contextualization of Silius' narrative: the Argives are opposing the Thebans, who are significantly under the protection of Bacchus. What is more, in the Nemea episode, Bacchus is also, up to a point, associated with Hercules, explicitly mentioned as a famous visitor of the city (Stat. *Theb.* 4.157–164).[67] The Statian intertextual

---

60 See Green (2010) 154–162.

61 See Marks (2005) 243; cf. also Scott (1975) 90, 102, 114–115.

62 See Vessey (1973) 12–13; cf. also, however, the reservations expressed by Ripoll (1999) 151.

63 See Marks (2005) 236 and n. 93.

64 Littlewood (2013a) 211–212 plausibly detects stylistic and thematic similarities between the two narratives.

65 See Marks (2005) 227, 243; cf. also Stover (2012) 70 and n. 144.

66 See also Marks (2005) 224–227; cf. also Scott (1975) 141–147; Zecchini (2011) 35; and von Albrecht (2011) 100–101.

67 See Vessey (1973) 165 and Soerink's essay in this volume, pp. 177–180.

models of Hannibal are yet again presented as adversaries of a Bacchus / Hercules, i.e., as opposing Domitian's public image, also assimilated by Silian Scipio, who functions as the epic symbolism, "an historical prefiguration" of the *princeps* (cf. Sil. 17.645–650).[68] Fabius is associated, just like Domitian, not only with Hercules (see p. 260 above) but also, through the Falernian vines incident in particular, with Bacchus as well, who is presiding over the vineyards ravaged by Fabius' opponent, Hannibal.[69]

4. *Conclusions*

Silius Italicus appears to be capitalizing on techniques of intertextual allusion, in order to strengthen the juxtaposition of his basic epic figures, a contrast on which the narrative of the seventh book is largely structured. This device is quite complex, in relation as least to Silius' main epic Roman predecessor, Virgil, who also availed himself of methods of alternate intertextual references;[70] this quality of Silius results, however, mainly from the epigonal character of his epic poetry. The Homeric intertext is, therefore, often interweaved and diffracted through the prism of a parallel reading of Virgilian, Lucanean, and Statian passages, chiefly "window references" to the Homeric intertexts of the Silian passages in question (e.g., Silian night raid = Statian Thiodamas' attack and Hopleus and Dymas incident = Virgilian Nisus-Euryalus night attack = Homeric *Doloneia* / Silian Hannibal = Lucan's Caesar = Virgilian Turnus = Homeric Achilles). Homeric references, in particular, do not seem to construct a clear intertextual opposition between the two main epic adversaries of book 7; various Virgilian, Lucanean, and Statian intertexts, however, may be read as helping the *doctus lector* to construct an unequivocal intertextual contrast between Hannibal and his "positive double," Fabius.

Nonetheless, particular details of the Silian incidents, though primarily fashioned after Homeric texts, do not seem to derive directly from these

68 Marks (2005) 218. I am not convinced by the "pessimistic" readings of the *Thebaid*, i.e., works that understand the epic as a cryptic discourse of opposition against the Domitianic regime. I am more sympathetic towards the optimism of pro-Domitian readings of the poem, with Theseus as a symbolism of Domitian or, in any case, of the re-establishment of peace by the Flavian regime; for an account of these two schools of Statian criticism, see Ganiban (2007) 5.

69 Cf. Cowan (2013) 230, who convincingly reads a further link between Fabius and Bacchus at the end of the seventh book of the *Punica* (7.746–750).

70 See, e.g., Klaassen (2010) 103 and 106.

Homeric models; still these details occasionally point, in turn, to Lucanean "window references" to Virgilian intertexts of no Homeric provenance, which also secure the character opposition (Hannibal vs. Fabius) that permeates the seventh book (Silian arson of the oxen = Lucan's drifting fires = Virgil's *Troia capta*). This complex system of "window referencing" is further complemented by several other individual / "non-window reference" intertextual allusions of the Silian narrative in question, also bringing about a contrast between Hannibal and Fabius (Silian oxen set on fire = Virgilian Noricum plague). What is more, the multiple intertexts of a Silian passage, suggesting as they do character rivalry, may occasionally function as intratexts of each other within a specific epic model (Virgilian Pandarus' incident = Priam's slaughter at the hands of Neoptolemus). Hannibal is thus not only associated with a valiant Homeric Achilles or a mindful general like the Homeric Agamemnon, but also with figures and instances of "negative associations" within the Virgilian heroic and didactic epic, as well as Lucan's and Statius' poems: the Carthaginian leader is chiefly likened to characters either conspicuously short of obvious epic values (e.g., Virgil's Cacus) or, in any case, presented, at the moment of their comparison with the Silian epic protagonist, through their shortcomings of character and epic action (e.g., Virgil's Nisus, Lucan's Caesar). Furthermore, Fabius' Silian epic profile is built on positive Greek and Roman epic intertexts, and the *Cunctator* is linked with figures exemplifying paradigmatic values of both Greek and Roman epic ideology (e.g., Lucan's Cato or Homer's and Statius' Nestor). Hannibal's character is thus outlined through intertexts whereby the contextual setting suggests an obvious association of the Carthaginian leader with situations countering the epic ideology as promoted by the Roman epic authors who function as models of the Silian narrative (Statius, Lucan, and Virgil). Fabius' portrait, on the other hand, is noticeably built on intertexts promoting epic model ideals.

What is more, and not by coincidence, in shaping Hannibal's epic portrayal, i.e., the image of the Roman enemy par excellence, Silius makes use of Virgilian epic models who have been convincingly read as possible political symbolisms of historical opponents of Rome and its prince in particular; this depends, up to a point of course, on whether one reads the *Aeneid* optimistically or in a pessimistic way, i.e., by means of the two established and too familiar by now interpretative trends of the scholarship on the Virgilian epos. From this perspective, Virgilian Turnus' and Cacus' political associations with Mark Antony and Cleopatra, in opposition to the image of a Fabius / Aeneas, seem to account further for this specific Silian reappropriation of Virgilian models. Caesar's conflict with Nero's ancestor,

Domitius Ahenobarbus, yet again provides a further intertextual model for Hannibal as an "enemy of the *princeps*." Hannibal is thus presented as an opponent of the "New Augustus" / Domitian against Fabius, who overtly incorporates features from Domitian's public image (Hercules, Bacchus).

Silius Italicus is, accordingly, included among the epic poets of the imperial period who practise a similar complex technique of intertextual portrayals, adopting this method of parallel, multiple, and multifaceted epic allusive references on the level of indirect characterization.

LOYALTY AND THE LYRE: CONSTRUCTIONS OF *FIDES* IN HANNIBAL'S CAPUAN BANQUETS

R. Joy Littlewood

1. *Introduction: The Greco-Roman Ethos of Conviviality*

The sanctity associated with communal dining derived from its religious origins: a ritual sacrifice followed by a communal feast with libation and prayer addressed to a divine recipient.[1] Banquets were the natural sequel to sacrifice. The πίστις, or *fides*, implicit in a sacrificial contract between gods and men, was extended, in the topos of the epic banquet, to guest-friendship between host and stranger through which a new alliance or agreement might be ratified in an ambiance of gracious hospitality. The host's wealth and position was indicated by valuable, antique tableware and throngs of serving men, while his god-fearing character was illustrated by a formal libation or sacrifice to the gods. The theme of the bard's song provided a reflective intermezzo on a theme symbolically relevant to the epic narrative,[2] while his musical skill has the power to stir the emotions of his listeners. In the Greco-Roman world commensality, enhanced by the music of the lyre, was not only a measure of civilized leisure,[3] but a source of civic harmony.[4] In this setting men were inspired by *carmina conuiuialia*, in praise of illustrious men, to formulate the essence and value of civic virtue. In his fifth *Pythian* ode, Pindar celebrates Apollo for having bestowed the gifts of the lyre and the communal banquet on men whom he has inspired to cultivate peace and stable government.[5] His first *Pythian* begins with praise for Apollo's lyre, as the bringer of peace and harmony, but Pindar goes on to formulate

---

1 See Schmitt-Pantel (1990).

2 Demodocus (Hom. *Od.* 8.75–82, 499–520), Orpheus (A. R. 1.496–511, V. Fl. 1.250–296) and Iopas (Virg. *Aen.* 1.740–746). Schenk (1999b) 352 and n. 3.

3 Plb. 4.20–21.

4 See Habinek (2005) 40–43 on the banquet as a stabilizing civic institution uniting the aristocratic rulers.

5 Pind. *Pyth.* 5.63–69.

the antithesis of convivial concord: enemies of Zeus, driven by hubris and arrogance, who recoil in horror from the delights of the lyre and the convivial feast. These he defines more precisely as rebellious Giants, unjust tyrants and, with topical relevance at the time, belligerent Etruscans or Carthaginians, imputing their inability to comprehend the blessings of conviviality to moral inadequacy and lack of finesse.[6] The myth, or literary symbol, which represented the clash of barbarism with the civilized Greco-Roman world was the Battle of Lapiths and Centaurs at the wedding feast of Pirithous and Hippodameia.

In Roman cult, Jupiter replicated Zeus' patronage of civic order, binding oaths and military alliances. Further he had a close association with civic banqueting: Rome's most important sacrificial banquet, the *epulum Iouis*, was celebrated in his honor on September 13th during the *Ludi Romani*. In a sense the participants were sharing a contractual banquet with the god who presided over Roman *foedera*.[7] Silius depicts the arrogance and monstrous impiety of Rome's greatest enemy as a gigantomachic obsession to overthrow Tarpeian Jupiter. Nowhere in Roman literature was tyrannical cruelty more vividly exemplified than at the tyrant's feast. Discussing a certain Flaminius who executed a criminal during a banquet, Seneca the Elder, makes the point that banquets are no place for execution since such an action surpasses tyrants in cruelty.[8] A short review of the recurrence of convivial abuse in Flavian literature will indicate how the epic banquet offered Silius a multifaceted opportunity to expose Hannibal's moral flaws, fulfilling, at the same time, Pindar's criteria of an "enemy of Zeus."

2. *Abuses of Conviviality in Roman Imperial Literature*

Distortion of the true ethos of conviviality was a consequence of the influx of wealth and consumerism which accompanied Rome's imperial growth. In the late Republic political invective associated gluttony and profligacy with

---

6 Pind. *Pyth.* 1.1–8. The poem was written in honor of "Hieron of Etna" (line 32) whose Deinomenid dynasty had defeated the Carthaginians at Himera in 480 and the Etruscans at Cumae in 474 BCE.

7 Habinek (2005) 42.

8 Sen. *Contr.* 9.2.4: *scelus est in conuiuio damnare hominem: quid occidere?* ("it is a crime to condemn a man at a banquet; how much worse to kill him?"). Seneca compares this with tyrant behavior (9.2.7), noting the impropriety of a Roman official who mixes execution with private dining (9.2.24). See also Seneca's discussion in the *De ira* (*Dial.* 4.33.3–5.18.1). Abuse of this kind is discussed by Corbeill (1997) 107–110 and De Blois (2010).

depravity in the dining room; this included the use of perfumes, effeminate dress, unedifying entertainment and lascivious dancing.[9] Abuse of conviviality was deployed by the Roman satirists in a wide spectrum of dining room disasters where grotesque excess contrasted with the parsimonious treatment of inferiors.[10] In Lucan's epic rampant *luxuria* (*luxus inani ambitione furens*, "made mad by empty ostentation," Luc. 10.156–157) heightens the crime of civil war when, not far from the scene of Pompey's murder, Caesar feasts on foreign delicacies and sacred beasts piled high on golden plates. His hostess, Cleopatra, meanwhile, is described in terms of a harlot, painted, perfumed and diaphanously clad,[11] and the song-substitute, Acoreus' geographical monologue, so delights Caesar that he declares himself tempted to abandon civil war if he may see (with a view to controlling) the secret and source of the Nile.[12] Philosophical works and tragedy of the Neronian period explored the conjunction of feasting with the immoderate anger and bloodshed of literary tyrants. Abuse of power by a ruler or a wealthy patron could be achieved by establishing social divisions at what should have been a festive meal. Among these Pliny's *solitaria cena* became a political metaphor for tyranny in Roman imperial ideology.[13] As variations of convivial misconduct, *luxuria* violated the imperial virtues of *moderatio* and *modestia*, while power abuse in the dining room violated those of *ciuilitas* and *comitas*. While Flavian Rome set a high value on tasteful refinement in convivial entertainment, excess and decadence continued to be vilified as *luxuria*. The disparity of imperial *luxuria* with the hardiness, frugality and martial vigor which had made Rome great, the much poeticized contrast "Rome now and then," is represented in the *Punica* by Silius' contrasting allegories of Virtus, who inspires Rome's tenacious pursuit of world domination, and Voluptas, who promises that she and *luxuria* will reign supreme in a future (imperial) Rome.[14]

---

9 Cic. *Phil.* 2 *passim* and *Leg.* 2.39. See also Corbeill (1997) 99.

10 Juv. 4 and 5. See Gowers (1993) 211–212. Cf. Stat. *Silu.* 1.6.35–38, 43–50, where Domitian is a model of commensality.

11 Luc. 10.109–333.

12 Luc. 10.191–192. On this philosophical discussion, see Manolaraki (2012) 80–115.

13 Plin. *Pan.* 49.6; Juv. 1.94–95, 135–141; Plut. *Luc.* 41.2. On politicizing dining in the literature of imperial Rome, see esp. Braund (1996a).

14 Sil. 15.123–127, 92–97. See Fucecchi's discussion of the episode in this volume, pp. 316–319. Similar is Seneca's assimilation of Virtus with civic responsibility and Voluptas with self-indulgence: *Quid dissimilia immo diuersa componitis? Altum quiddam est uirtus, excelsum et regale, inuictum, infatigabile: uoluptas humile, seruile, imbecillum, caducum, cuius statio ac*

These ideas are encapsulated in the two lines which conclude Silius' narrative of Cannae:

> haec tum Roma fuit. post te cui uertere mores
> si stabat fatis, potius, Carthago, maneres. (Sil. 10.657–658)
>
> Such was Rome in those days; and, if it was fated that the Roman character should change when Carthage fell, would that Carthage were still standing.

This memorable couplet is subtly interwoven with a significant intertext which points forward to the sacrosanctity of loyalty, of *fides* and *foedera*, the central theme of *Punica* 11.

The second half of the final line resonates with Virgil's apostrophe to the Alban traitor, Mettus Fufetius, on the shield of Aeneas: *at tu dictis, Albane, maneres!* ("but you, Alban, should have stood by your words!" Virg. *Aen.* 8.643).[15] In Rome's regal period Alba Longa rivaled Rome, her daughter city, for supremacy in Italy; in the ensuing conflict the Alban leader, Mettus Fufetius, was captured and executed for breaking Alba's sacred *foedera* with Rome.[16] The relationship between the mother city and its daughter colony, Alba and Rome, mirrors the relationship between Rome and Capua and Rome and Saguntum. Silius celebrates the predominance of *fides* in Roman ethics by the distinction he draws between the loyalty of Saguntum, in books 1 and 2, and the immorality of Capua's decision, in book 11, to rupture the sacred bonds of *fides* by alliance with Hannibal. The Roman belief in the sacrosanctity of oaths[17] set them apart from their ethnic stereotype of treacherous Carthaginians and barbarians whom they regarded as habitual

---

domicilium fornices et popinae sunt. Virtutem in templo conuenies, in foro, in curia, pro muris stantem, puluerulentam, coloratam, callosas habentem manus; uoluptatem latitantem saepius ac tenebras captantem circa balinea ac sudatoria ac loca aedilem metuentia, mollem, eneruem, mero atque unguento madentem, pallidam aut fucatam et medicamentis pollinctam ("Why do you link things which are not just dissimilar but actually divergent? Virtue is lofty and kingly. She cannot be conquered nor exhausted. Pleasure is base and servile, ineffectual; she lurks in brothels and taverns. Virtue you will find in the temple, the forum, the senate house or defending the city walls, dusty, tanned and calloused. Pleasure you will discover lying low in the shadows, around the public baths, in the sleazy parts of town, soft and effete, reeking of wine and nard, pallid and painted [as though] made up by the mortuary beautician," *Dial.* 7.7.3).

15 Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.54–56. On this intertext, see Fowler (2000) 123–126 and Tipping (2007) 245–231.

16 Liv. 1.22–26; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 3.2–30. On the importance of *syngeneia* in *Punica* 11, see Bernstein (2010).

17 Cic. *Off.* 3.104. For an analysis of the contrast of Saguntine *fides* and Capuan *perfidia*, see Schenk (1999b) 360–364. An instrumental study of *fides* in the poem is Burck's (1988).

oath breakers: *pro barbara numquam impolluta fides*! ("but alas, barbarians are ever foul traitors!" Sil. 13.678–679).[18]

3. *Constructions of* fides *in Silius' Capuan Banquets*

Deriving his theme from a single banquet which Livy describes during Hannibal's sojourn in Capua in the winter of 216 / 215 BCE,[19] Silius elaborates his narrative of Capua's defection from Rome in two contiguous banquets which occupy more than half of *Punica* 11. This unusually spacious treatment of the epic banquet topos provides an appropriate setting for the Capuans to cement their treacherous alliance with the victor of Cannae and for the poet to describe Hannibal's surrender to Capuan decadence. The dyadic structure opens the possibility for the bard, Teuthras, to celebrate in two separate songs, one at each banquet, the double potency of *fides*, the Latin homonym for loyalty and the lyre.

In the first banquet Silius explores the theme of *fides* as loyalty, violated first by Capua and then by Hannibal, as he exerts a tyrant's power over Capua's citizens, inspiring yet a third potential violation of *fides*, this time of guest friendship, *hospitium*, in an attempted political assassination by a Capuan patriot. In the second banquet the poet explores the alternative significance of *fides*, the lyre. This too has undergone an ethical demotion. Teuthras' song celebrates the power of the music of the lyre, an entirely appropriate symposiac theme in civilized Greco-Roman society. In Capua, however, this lyre is played at Venus' express command to her *Cupidines*, as the second stage in Hannibal's corruption, following wine-drinking and preceding amorous nocturnal adventures:

> tum deinde madenti
> post epulas sit grata chelys, segnisque soporas
> aut nostro uigiles ducat sub numine noctes. (Sil. 11.407–409)

> And then, when he has well drunk, let him welcome the lyre after the feast and either spend the night in drowsy sleep or wake all night in my service.

Accordingly, when Teuthras observes Hannibal's fascination with his art, he deliberately chooses, from a wide selection, his most seductive song: *e multis*

[18] The elder Scipio begins his narrative of his last battle by cursing the perfidy of Hasdrubal's Spanish mercenaries.

[19] Liv. 23.8–9. This banquet describes Pacuvius' son's plot to assassinate Hannibal at the feast because he was a follower of the Capuan patriot Decius Magius (Sil. 11.303–368).

carpsit mollissima ("he chose out of many, as most delightful," 11.439). The superlative *mollissima* with its elegiac connotations emphasizes Hannibal's rejection of *maiora*, the *asper labor* of epic warfare which a hero must endure: *insomnes noctes frigusque famemque domabis* ("you will endure sleepless nights and you will master cold and hunger," 15.110).[20] The true state of affairs is stated plainly in the final section of the song, that Teuthras has been destroying, *frangebat*, Hannibal's manly virtue with his langorous music:

> sic tunc Pierius bellis durata uirorum
> pectora Castalio frangebat carmine Teuthras. (Sil. 11.481–482)
>
> Thus Teuthras, votary of Castalia and the Muses, enfeebled by his music the soldiers' war-hardened hearts.

4. *A Structural Plan of* Punica *11*

Programmatic statement: *stat nulla diu mortalibus usquam / Fortuna titubante fides* ("nowhere do men remain loyal for long when Fortune proves unstable," 3–4).

1–32: List of Italian tribes defecting to Carthage culminating in Capua.

33–54: Capua's depravity (*luxuria* / civic unrest) mirrored in opulent but violent banquets.

55–130: Capua defects when Rome refuses her demand to share the Roman consulate.

131–200: Capua's alliance with Hannibal opposed by Decius, patriot of Trojan ancestry.

First Capuan banquet: "The Violation of fides"

FRAME 201–266: With a tyrant's fury Hannibal condemns Decius' *fides*; with a tyrant's indifference to execution he enters Capua triumphant and serene.

BANQUET 267–290: Adorned as a god Hannibal reclines apart in the place of honor.

> Splendor of feast: ancient costly tableware, myriad attendants, lavish food.
>
> Teuthras' Song 291–297: "The eponymous founder's genealogy"
>
> [subtext: Capys' descent from Jupiter, god of binding oaths, and the royal house of Troy should strengthen Capua's *foedera* with Rome]

---

[20] Here Virtus defines the hard toil, *asper labor* (103–104), essential to the hero's path to the stars.

FRAME 303–368: Perolla's plan to assassinate Hannibal to redeem violated *fides* / *polluta foedera* (321) is aborted by his father's insidious counter-argument that *fides* is now owed to guest-friendship with Hannibal and the Carthaginians: *polluta hospitia* (335).

Second Capuan Banquet: "The Vengeance of fides (*the lyre*)*"*

FRAME 369–384: Mago brings Carthage the spoils of Cannae.

BANQUET 385–439: Triumph of Venus / Voluptas: the Conqueror conquered.

Teuthras' Second Song 440–480: "The power of the lyre"

FRAME 502–541: Mago demands military supplies for Hannibal's future conquests.

Epilogue 542–611: Mago's demands are opposed by Hanno, motivated by *inuidia et ira* (554). His arguments are perceptive (*uos metuo, Cannae*, 574) and cogent (*pax optima rerum* / … *pax una triumphis* / *innumeris potior* …, "peace is the best thing … peace alone is better than a thousand triumphs," 592–594). Significantly he concludes by urging the Carthaginians to revert to *fides: fama fugetur ab urbe / perfidiae* ("let the reproach of treachery be banished from the city," 596–597). But his voice is ignored and supplies are sent to Hannibal.

To contrast and balance his narrative of the inviolable *fides* of Saguntum in books 1–2, Silius opens the second half of the *Punica* with a deeply unedifying programmatic statement: the poet will list the communities who violated their alliance with Rome by joining the Libyans after Cannae. The list culminates with a denunciation of Capua's lack of *fides*, doubly shocking because Capua was a city of Trojan origin, reputedly founded by Capys, one of Aeneas' companions, and therefore bound to Rome by ancient *foedera* (11.28–32).[21] Capua is introduced as a city no longer subject to the rule of law as a result of her citizens' enslavement to luxury and idleness nourished by mad orgies: *luxus et in sanis nutrita ignauia lustris* ("luxury and sloth, fed by riotous debauchery," 11.33). Rocked by anarchy, class-war and rebellion, her citizens feast from noon until dawn. In a striking inversion of Pindar's morally uplifting conviviality of just rulers, Silius describes the Capuans, richly adorned in purple, gold, and silver, titillating their depravity by gladiatorial combats which leave the tables blood-spattered and corpses strewn among the goblets:[22]

---

[21] Capua had previously defected from an alliance with Rome after their defeat at the Caudine Forks in the Samnite wars of the fourth century.

[22] Carnage among the tables, *respersis non parco sanguine mensis* (54), has resonances with Ovid's marriage of Perseus and Andromeda (Ov. *Met.* 5.40: *positas aspergit sanguine*

> mos olim et miscere epulis spectacula dira
> certantum ferro, saepe et super ipsa cadentum
> pocula respersis non parco sanguine mensis. (Sil. 11.52–54)
>
> It was their ancient custom to enliven their banquets with bloodshed and to combine with their feasting the horrid sight of armed men fighting; often the combatants fell dead above the very cups of the revelers, and the tables were stained with streams of blood.

These characteristics of Capuan depravity—bestial violence, *luxuria* and the rule of force—correspond to the personified Fides' description, in *Punica* 2, of human vices which, she tells Hercules, have driven her from the earth (2.494–505).[23] Loyalty, with the self-sacrifice this entails, cannot coexist with the pursuit of self-indulgence. It is to regenerate the martial spirit of the Romans which had been corrupted by "the sweet poison of leisure" (*blandoque ueneno / desidiae*, 3.580–581) that Jupiter claims that he devised the Second Punic War.

Characteristically Silius puts an emotive and a (Flavian) ideological slant on the historical narrative. The Carthaginians' surrender to the decadence of Capua occurs at a time when Hannibal had failed to consolidate his victory at Cannae by marching on Rome and occupying the city.[24] In the second half of book 10, the poet studiedly tilts the balance in Rome's favor by showing Hannibal's self-confidence severely shaken by a prophetic dream, his disagreement with the hitherto devoted Mago and the fears for his own future, which he expresses as he stands beside Paulus' pyre (10.377–386 and 572–575). Meanwhile the defeated Romans reinforce the ragged remnants of their army with children and slaves, grimly tenacious in their refusal to ransom nearly 20,000 military prisoners to defend their city (10.641–652). As the Romans rededicate themselves to the ennobling pursuit of Virtus, the Carthaginians fall victim to Voluptas in a carefully structured and thematically significant drama.

---

mensas, "stains the laden tables with blood"). Liv. 9.40.17 mentions gladiatorial contests at Capuan banquets; cf. also Liv. 23.9.4, 39.43.4 and Curt. 8.7.5. On the incompatibility of bloodshed with banqueting, Sen. *Contr*. 9.2.5. For a parody of fighting at an epic banquet, see Athen. 134D–137C.

23 Cf. Ov. *Met*. 1.128–150, where Astraea (Justice) is driven by Iniquity from the world of men.

24 Liv. 23.18 describes Hannibal's lackluster attempt after Cannae to capture the smaller, Roman-held town of Casilinum and his subsequent retreat into Capua for the winter; the historian concludes that contemporary military experts considered this an even greater mistake than his failure to follow up Cannae by marching on Rome.

Intertextual allusions to Dido's two banquets for Aeneas in *Aeneid* 1 and 4 hint at an ominous renewal of *hospitium* between Carthaginians and the *Aeneadae*. A second time the fortunes of the Aeneadae are rescued by Venus, their divine patron, who manipulates Hannibal as she manipulated Dido and Aeneas in her guise as Voluptas so that the Carthaginians will succumb to the enervating influence of luxury and love:

> … et Tyriam pubem tacitis exurite telis.
> amplexu multoque mero somnoque uirorum
> profliganda acies, quam non perfregerit ensis … (Sil. 11.396–398)
>
> … and inflame the hearts of the Tyrians with your invisible weapons. With dalliance, with excess of wine and sleep, you must rout an army that neither sword nor fire could shatter …[25]

This Capuan banqueting hall bears a close resemblance to Dido's banqueting hall in Carthage which is suggestive of ancient riches: the chamber is lofty, multiple torches transform night into day, countless attendants carry ancient tableware glittering with gold and gems.[26] Like Aeneas, the Carthaginians are overcome by invisible forces, *caeco … / exitio* (11.386–387).[27] They absorb self-indulgence *per uiscera*, through every fiber of their bodies (11.400).[28] Hannibal is eager for the daily banquet where he may indulge in the Capuans' willing hospitality (11.420–422).[29] He spends the winter in comfort and revelry (11.403–404 and 418–419),[30] neglecting his military duties (11.415–417).[31] The soldier's endurance of cold and hunger under the stars, is presented, by Virtus and Voluptas respectively, as the positive and negative example of Roman military *labor* and *fides*.[32] Through the comforts of *luxuria* Capua becomes for Hannibal *altera Karthago*, as Carthage became for Aeneas another Troy (*altera iam patria atque aequo sub honore uocatur / altera Karthago Capua*, "Capua is now a second home to him: he calls it a second Carthage and honors it as much," 11.424–425).[33] The

25 Cf. also Sil. 11.385–394 and Virg. *Aen.* 1.657.
26 Virg. *Aen.* 1.725–730 ~ Sil. 11.274–280 ~ V.Fl. 2.651–654.
27 Cf. *caeco igni* at Virg. *Aen.* 4.2.
28 Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 4.66 and 101.
29 Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 4.77.
30 Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 4.193.
31 Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 4.86–89 and 260–265.
32 Sil. 15.109–112 (Virtus), 48–52 (Voluptas). Virtus specifically castigates banqueting, defined by perfume and purple garments (116–117), as man's alternative to successful conquest (119–120).
33 The line is later echoed bitterly by Capua's Roman conqueror Fulvius (13.100). Similarly

intertextual emphasis thus far implies that banqueting, wine and music, the effeminate lure of a rich oriental city, has the power to conquer a hero who has suffered many trials.

Traditionally the banquet topos marked a turning point in an epic narrative and the Capuans' first banquet for Hannibal seals a new alliance: *delecta manus iungebat foedera Poeno* ("the chosen body of envoys made a treaty with Hannibal," 11.190). In different ways the poet subtly diverts from Hannibal the sympathy and admiration awakened for the storm-tossed Odysseus or Aeneas when they accept their host's generosity. Silius' contrast of perfidious Capua with loyal Saguntum is essential to the overall structure of the *Punica* and for this reason, especially, *fides* (and her abuse) play a dominant role in Hannibal's first banquet at Capua. When Virrius, supported by Pacuvius (11.311), brokers the treacherous alliance after Capua's demand to share the Roman consulate has been rejected, he distorts the facts, *ueris falsa … admiscens* (11.130–133).[34] Unexpectedly lured by Capua's wealth (11.260–267), easy treachery and, Silius hints, by her louche decadence, the victor of Cannae commits acts of power abuse which exemplify the literary tyrant in arrogance, cruelty, and impiety, substantiating the personified Fides' assertion that Loyalty cannot coexist with the evils encouraged by *luxuria*. To accentuate the image of Hannibal as a tyrant figure who abuses the royal virtue of commensality, Silius frames his first Capuan banquet with a pair of stories illustrating the heroic *fides* of two young Capuan patriots: Decius, who seeks to avert, and Perolla, who seeks to avenge the Capuans' violation of their long-standing alliance with Rome. Both these attempts, as they fail, expose moral violations of conviviality.

Learning of the Capuans' intention to go over to Hannibal, Decius, himself of Trojan descent, makes an impassioned protest:

> 'itis,' ait, 'ciues, uiolanda ad iura parentum,
> damnatumque caput temerati foederis aris
> iungitis hospitio? quae tanta obliuio recti?
> magnum atque in magnis positum populisque uirisque
> aduersa re ostentare fidem …' (Sil. 11.160–164)

> He said: "Fellow citizens, are you about to violate the ties which our fathers cherished and make friends with a man whom the gods have condemned for breach of treaty? How utterly you have forgotten the path of duty! It is

Aeneas appears to have assumed the role of Dido's husband and ruler of Carthage (*Aen.* 4.260–265).

[34] The Capuans' specious argument for breaking their alliance with Rome is set out at 11.148–154.

> a noble thing, and a property of noble nations and noble men, to show loyalty in adversity …"

Significant are the loaded phrases which underline his belief in the sacrosanctity of *fides* and *foedera*. For Capua to join Carthage is to violate ancestral treaties, *itis … uiolanda ad iura parentum*, and such a breach of *fides* is compounded by Hannibal's breaking the original treaty with Rome which should have prevented him from attacking Saguntum, *temerati foederis* (161). In Rome's hour of need after Cannae, Capua should show *fides* towards Rome. Professing his own Trojan origins, Decius claims that no man of Trojan blood should tolerate a leader who rules by force rather than sacred treaty: *cui nunc pro foedere proque / iustitia est ensis* ("whose sword now usurps the place of justice," 11.183–184). Decius, would rather die (11.187–188). His eagerness for *mors uoluntaria* rather than to betray *fides* aligns Decius with the Saguntine hero Murrus whom Hannibal had scornfully challenged: *fer tecum castam fidem seruataque iura* ("Take with you to the Underworld your unstained oath of loyalty!" 1.481). Decius' defiance and his uncompromising patriotism, like Murrus', rouses Hannibal to fury:

> suffuderat ora
> sanguis, et a toruo surgebant lumine flammae.
> tum rictus spumans et anhelis faucibus acta
> uersabant penitus dirum suspiria murmur. (Sil. 11.218–221)
>
> His face was flushed with blood, and his angry eye flashed fire; he foamed at the mouth; and the breathing that issued from his panting lungs expressed the inarticulate rage of his breast.[35]

With his angry face reddening, his flashing eyes, heavy breathing, and inarticulate growl he merges into a portrait of a literary tyrant, to which Silius has slyly added the barbaric and bestial detail of foaming at the mouth. The resemblance does not escape the high principled Decius:

> 'necte ocius,' inquit
> '(nam sic Hannibalem decet intrauisse) catenas,
> foederis infausti pretium. sic uictima prorsus
> digna cadit Decius. nec enim te sanguine laetum
> humano sit fas caesis placasse iuuencis.
> en dextra! en foedus! nondum tibi curia necdum
> templorum intrati postes: iam panditur acri
> imperio carcer. (Sil. 11.247–254)

35 In *Pan.* 48.5, Pliny describes Domitian, the tyrannical murderer with his love for feasting alone; Seneca emphasizes the ugliness of bestial anger (*Dial.* 3.1.2–4, 6). See also Virg. *Aen.* 10.270–275, 12.101–102; Sen. *Oed.* 957–958.

> He said: "Put on the fetters with all speed: they are the fitting symbol of Hannibal's entrance and the just reward for this ill-starred alliance. Decius is indeed the fit victim to be slain. For Hannibal delights in human blood, and we should do wrong to appease him by the sacrifice of oxen. Look at his friendship! Look at his alliance! He has not yet entered the senate-house or the temple doors, but already the cruel tyrant opens the prison!"

Ironically Dido's criticism of Trojan perfidy, *en dextra fidesque!* (Virg. *Aen.* 4.597) is here echoed by a man of Trojan blood to deplore a Carthaginian's disloyalty.[36]

Hannibal undergoes a disconcerting transformation from almost bestial fury to cheerful serenity, *sedato pectore* (11.259), as he turns from his condemned prisoner to enter Capua with a light heart, triumphantly victorious, *uictor ouans*, (11.259), as he joyfully surveys the city of his new allies with untroubled gaze: *serenos / laetus circumfert oculos* ("in triumph he turned his gaze," 11.260–261). His mood swing has affinities with barbarian tyrants described by Seneca[37] who kill dispassionately in the course of a banquet. Power abuse in a host, culminating in murder or execution, defines the gruesome feast prepared by Seneca's Atreus for his brother Thyestes. Scaled down, a tyrant host might devise entertainments to discomfit his guests, like Domitian's banquet on a funereal theme designed to terrify a group of Roman senators.[38]

The image of tyranny marks Hannibal's demeanor at his first Capuan banquet. Prominently placed as first word in the hexameter, *regifice* defines how the Capuans "celebrate with banquets in their customary fashion" (*instituunt de more epulas*, 11.270). The rare Ennian adverb picks up *regales epulae* in his opening defamation of the monstrous banquets of Capua.[39] Capua with her oriental Trojan origins prefigures a later Rome, corrupted by the wealth of her imperial expansion.[40] Far from hesitating, modestly, on the thresh-

---

36 Silius' account of the Romans retaking Capua (13.94–381) concludes with the words: *Capua infaustum luit haud sine sanguine culpam* ("Capua paid a high price for her ill-omened misjudgement," 13.381).

37 Sen. *Dial.* 5.14.1–2, 15.1.

38 Dio Cass. 67.9.

39 *medioque dierum / regales epulae atque ortu conuiuia solis / deprensa* ("their princely banquets began at noon, and the rising sun found them at their revels," 11.41–43). Statius (*Silu.* 4.2.1–7) uses the word *regia* to compare Domitian's feast with the epic banquets described by Homer and Virgil. See Newlands (2002) 260–283.

40 Cowan (2002). Capua was an Etruscan city from the seventh until the fifth century BCE, when the Etruscan rulers were overthrown by Oscan-speaking Samnites and their leader, Capys (Liv. 4.37.1). As Rome gained control over Campania in the mid-fourth century, the

old in the manner of a Homeric guest, Hannibal hubristically proclaims his divine status by his attire, *deum cultu et sacro dignatus honore* ("adorned like a god and received with divine honors," 11.272). He takes the seat of honor, significantly described as *procul* and *sublime*, from which, in contrast to the Carthaginian soldiers, who marvel at the lavish feast (11.273–274), he dines in disapproving silence (11.283–284). The ethos of Greco-Roman conviviality demanded equal participation in a communal feast where morally uplifting dialogue was stimulated by moderate consumption.[41] The polar opposite of this is Plato's tyrant, who dines alone, violating the social or religious ethos of conviviality, a slave to his appetite like the solitary gourmand in Juvenal's first *Satire*.[42] Pliny uses the expression *solitaria cena* with reference to Domitian, alternately praising Trajan and execrating Domitian because one encouraged, the other avoided commensality.[43]

Livy identifies Hannibal's hosts, at a single banquet, as Sthenius and Pacuvius Ninnius Celer (Liv. 23.8–9),[44] mentioning the occasion in order to describe the assassination attempt of Pacuvius' young son, Calavius, whom Silius names Perolla. When Hannibal usurps the dominant role of host[45] by pouring a libation in honor of Capys, his action speaks of conquest rather than a guest-host relationship based on mutual *fides*. Intertextual similarities with Dido's banquet for Aeneas, suggest that Silius may have intended to contrast Hannibal's ignorance of banqueting propriety with Virgil's Dido, a legitimate hostess, who pours libations before the feast commences for the purpose of invoking the blessing of appropriate deities: to Jupiter, the god of guest-friendship, to Bacchus, giver of wine, and to Juno, the guardian goddess of Carthage.[46]

Teuthras' song tells of the close ancestral ties which bind the family of Aeneas to the founder of Capua, and, by implication, the *fides* and *foedera*

Capuans were rewarded for their loyalty by an alliance with Rome (Liv. 8.11.16). Capua's history of violating *foedera* began with her defection to the Samnites after Rome's defeat at the Caudine Forks in 321 BCE.

41 See Slater (1990); Corbeill (1997); Gowers (1993).

42 Plat. *Rep*. 573a–b, 575a; Juv. 1.94–95 and 135–141; Sen. *Thy*. 908–919; Plin. *Pan*. 49.2. See also Littlewood (2008) 259–263.

43 Plin. *Pan*. 48.3–50. See Braund (1996a) for a discussion of commensality as an ancient kingly virtue.

44 Pacuvius' son Calavius, an ardent supporter of Decius Magius, plots to kill Hannibal at the feast in the hope that his action will appease Rome for Capua's defection to the Carthaginians.

45 Bettenworth (2004) 338–363 considers this the most significant formal anomaly at Hannibal's Capuan banquet.

46 Virg. *Aen*. 1.731–734.

which ought to bind Capua to Rome. The idea is reinforced in the line introducing the bard: *personat Euboica Teuthras testudine, Cymes / incola* … ("now Teuthras, a citizen of Cumae, played on the Euboean lyre," Sil. 11.288–289). The association between a daughter colony and the mother city is underlined in Teuthras' introduction: a citizen of Cumae, he plays a lyre from Euboea, Cumae's mother city. The first word, *personat*, is an allusion to Virgil's Iopas (*Aen.* 1.740–741) and Teuthras' words, *namque … canebat*, promises a reprise of Iopas' theme, the cosmological song which tells of order imposed on chaos, the division of land and water, the unchanging courses of the constellations which has affinities with Pindar's vision of an ordered society.[47] Despite its elegiac introduction, however, *laetos per furta canebat amores* ("he was singing of his sweet and secret dalliance," 11.291), the trajectory of Teuthras' song of Jupiter's love for Atlas' daughter, Electra, is the genealogy of the royal house of Troy from Jupiter down to Capys, founder of Capua, which appears to celebrate the ancient bond of Trojan blood binding Capua irrevocably to Rome (11.453–458).[48] It is possible to extract additional nuances. As Tyrians and Trojans join in applauding Dido's Iopas, so now their descendants applaud Teuthras: *concelebrant plausu pariter Sidonia pubes / Campaniaeque manus* ("Carthaginians and men of Capua together applauded the singer," 11.298–299).[49] When the (original) applause dies down, Virgil's Dido is described for the first time as *infelix* as she seeks to learn more about Aeneas. Her descendant, Hannibal, fully informed about Capys' descent from the family of Rome's founder, honors Capys as though he were a god: *augusto libat carchesia ritu* ("spilling wine on the tables in customary fashion," 11.300). It is evident that he has not appreciated the significance of the song.

Following a brief mention of joyful conviviality when Hannibal succumbs to the influence of wine and responds to Teuthras' lyre playing, Silius' reader-

47 Teuthras' "song of the cosmos," in Delz's edition part of his second song, is transferred by Summers to the first, after line 290, and approved by Bettenworth (2004) 363–369. Teuthras alludes to the cosmic song of Virgil's Silenus (*Ecl.* 6.31–40); cf. Virgil's Iopas (*Aen.* 1.740–746). Beginning *namque canebat*, both Silenus and Teuthras end with the Age of Saturn before continuing with myths pertinent to the context. For the view that Virgil's Silenus imitates Orpheus' song (A. R. 1. 496–504), see Ross (2008).

48 Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.73.3. Virgil's Capys was one of Aeneas' companions (*Aen.* 1.183, 2.35–39, 9.576, 10.143–145). Teuthras' Capys was the father of Anchises (Hom. *Il.* 20.23–29), therefore the eponymous rather than the founder of the city. This does not conflict with Dionysius' claim that Capua was founded by a son of Aeneas, Rhomos, who named the city after his great-grandfather.

49 Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.747.

audience is jolted back into reality by an abortive attempt, by Pacuvius' son, Perolla, to assassinate Hannibal as he dines.[50] Pacuvius attempts to deflect his son by entangling him in a moral maze. He stresses first *polluta hospitia* (335), *fides* violated by a blood-stained feast, and secondly his own personal obligation to intercept his son's sword thrust, which would make Perolla a parricide and violator of filial *fides* and *pietas*. Pacuvius' description of bloodstained goblets and overturned tables is wittily underlined by the poet's verbal allusions to the customary violence at Capuan feasts (*polluta hospitia ac tabo repleta cruento / pocula et euersa pugnae certamine mensas*, "the hospitable board and wine cups filled with gore, and the tables overset in mortal conflict," 11.335–336).[51]

Meanwhile verbal resonances accentuate the affinities of Perolla's intention to avenge with bloodshed Capua's violated *fides* with Decius' attempt to block the alliance by slaughtering the approaching Carthaginians (11.194–200 [Decius] with 318–320 [Perolla]). Decius' blunt challenge, *et ferro purgate nefas* ("wipe out your guilt with the sword!" 11.199), is an abridgment of the younger Perolla's boast: *hic erit ille, / qui polluta dolis iam foedera sanciet, ensis* ("this sword will ratify a treaty already dishonored by treachery," 11.320–321). The banquet which seals the new alliance with Carthage by guest-friendship is ominously framed by the bloodshed threatened by two young patriots to prevent it from violating Capua's original treaty with Rome. Between these framing sections Hannibal's outward serenity which follows the bestial rage with which he condemns Decius, his rich clothes and haughty disdain resembles the tyrants of Seneca's tragedy and philosophical writings.

On the following day a second banquet is held. As Hannibal and his victorious armies abandon themselves to the delights of hot baths and exotic food and wine, accompanied by the floor shows, *scenarum ludus* (11.429) devised by the luxury-loving Capuans, the poet mockingly consigns the Carthaginian to the ranks of effeminate banqueters lampooned in Roman satire.[52] This time the two framing episodes create tensions with the indolence and *luxuria* of the banquet: Mago sails for Carthage, to give news, supported by booty and captives, of the Carthaginian victory at Cannae and, in the closing frame, demands further military supplies for further conquests.

---

50 Liv. 23.8–9.
51 Cf. 11.53–55 quoted above.
52 Cf. Juv. 1.142–143.

Whereas Pindar's first Pythian ode celebrates Apollo's lyre as a symbol of peace and civic order, Teuthras' celebration of the lyre assists, not the pursuit of Virtus, but the assault on Hannibal of Venus / Voluptas and her conniving brood with their infallible weapons of dalliance, drinking and decadence. Ironically framed by Mago's belligerent mission to Carthage, the second Capuan banquet finds Hannibal reclining on a purple couch scented with Arabian perfumes and unmanned by langorous melodies.

It soon becomes clear that the theme of Teuthras' second song is again *fides*, but this time the synonym for *lyra, chelys* or *cithara*, which figures in several Horatian odes on festive banqueting.[53] Although Silius uses the expression *percussa fide* in line 452, he prefers *testudo* (11.286, 436, 441) or the Greek words *chelys* (11.408, 441, 451) or *cithara* (11.437, 471). The lyre introduces several dimensions of literary play. Hannibal's susceptibility to the music recalls Odysseus' emotion at the song of Demodocus. Intertextual allusion shows Hannibal abandoning his epic destiny like Virgil's Aeneas, who also whiles away a winter in luxury, adopts foreign garments of purple and gold, and regards his landfall as a second home, as we have seen above. Like Dido, Hannibal's resolution is weakened by metaphorical wounds, fire and madness, and he too eagerly renews the daily banquet. Silius introduces Teuthras' performance at the second banquet with the observation that Teuthras chose his subject, "The power of music," after he had noticed Hannibal's admiration for his skill on the lyre:

> isque ubi mirantem resonantia pollice fila
> ductorem uidit Libyae, canere inde superbas
> Aoniae laudes sensim testudinis orsus … (Sil. 11.434–436)

> And he [Teuthras], when he saw the general marveling at the sound his fingers drew from the strings, began by degrees to set forth the splendid triumphs of the Aonian lyre …

Carthaginian statuettes of female musicians, holding the lyre or another musical instrument, testify to the popularity of music among the nobility of Carthage to which Hannibal belonged. The conventional comparison, that Teuthras' union with his lyre surpassed the song of a dying swan associates the bard with the great legendary musicians of whom he now sings (11.437–438).[54] Celebration of the power of music, which had a moral value in

---

53 Horace uses *fides* for a lyre played at dinner (*Carm.* 1.24.14, 1.36.1). Statius uses *lyra* (*Theb.* 10.446; *Silu.* 1.3.100) but *fides* in *Silu.* 4.5.4.

54 Hardie (2010) 44–47 associates the singing swan imagery with metapoetic play and, in

Greco-Roman culture,[55] was an appropriate convivial theme.[56] Teuthras' four mythical lyres, or musicians, all have metapoetic associations with Flavian poetry. Amphion, whose lyre had the power to construct the walls of Thebes represents a reification of the composition of Statius' *Thebaid*, where the poet uses the imagery of Thebes' crumbling walls, which once towered skywards through the strains of the sacred lyre (Stat. *Theb*. 4.358–359), to mirror the moral decay of the house of Oedipus.[57] The second "lyre," mentioned by Teuthras is Arion, famous like Orpheus for his ability to control nature with his song: *turbatum plectro moderata profundum* ("calmed the stormy seas with its music," Sil. 11.446). It is Arion whom Statius likens to his friend Pollius, with his *docta lyra* (Stat. *Silu*. 3.1.119), for both control nature: Arion with music, Pollius with his landscape architecture. When Pollius and Statius "sing" together, like Arion, they charm the dolphins (3.1.116–120). The third lyre recalled by Teuthras is Chiron's lyre which "instructs" Achilles: *formabat … / heroum mentes et magni pectora Achillis* ("shaped the minds of heroes and the spirit of great Achilles," Sil. 11.449–450).[58] Finally Orpheus, the fourth and greatest singer, recalls Valerius' Orpheus, whose lyre teaches the rowers of Argo to row in harmony without clashing their oars: *sed carmine tonsas / ire docet summo passim ne gurgite pugnent* ("but with his song he teaches the oars to swing that they clash not everywhere upon the surface of the tide," V. Fl. 1.471–472).[59] Teuthras concludes his celebration of the power of the lyre with Virgil's legend of Orpheus, decapitated for his excessive devotion to Love by jealous Ciconian matrons.[60] With the humor that characterizes Silius' descriptions of Venus' machinations,[61] Virgil's image of Orpheus' head, tumbling, still singing, through the waters of the Hebrus, is extended, with

---

particular, with elegiac poetry. On the conjunction of singing swans with warriors and epic themes, see Habinek (2005) 163–170.

55 The combination of voice and lyre was valued far beyond the archaic period. For generals who sing to the lyre, see Quint. *Inst*. 1.10.14. In *Ep*. 9.17.3, Pliny cites singing with the lyre as elegant dinner party entertainment.

56 See Plut. *Mor*. 160E–162B where the story of Arion is related.

57 On building the walls of Thebes, see Sen. *Oed*. 611–612; Stat. *Theb*. 1.9–10, 4.356–360. On the walls' decay, Stat. *Theb*. 2.700, 7.426, as well as 4.356–360 for the Thebans' feeble attempt to repair them. See Bessone's discussion in this volume, pp. 215–233.

58 Newlands (2012) 93–96 specifies the education of the young Achilles as a dominant theme in the *Achilleid*.

59 Orpheus reappears to encourage his companions (V. Fl. 4.85).

60 Virg. *G*. 4.523: *caput reuulsum*; cf. Sil. 11.476 (*ora reuulsa*) and 478 (*caput a ceruice recisum*). See also Ov. *Met*. 11.56–60, where Orpheus' head, having reached the sea shore, is savaged by a serpent, and Wilson (2004) 232–234.

61 Cf. Silius' entertaining subversion of the Judgment of Paris at 7.438–470.

witty hyperbole, far out to sea, where it still has the power to charm the whales to leap and dive. Master-minded by Venus and her *Cupidines*, Hannibal's second Capuan banquet has become a parody of the epic topos. Where he should be stirring the victorious Carthaginians with the celebration of heroic valor (Stat. *Theb.* 1.33–37, V. Fl. 4.342–343), Teuthras mischievously concludes his celebration of the power of music with Virgil's implicit warning of the dangers of an elegiac devotion to Love and Song.[62] This humorous sketch illustrates Silius' technique of exploiting generic instability for a serious purpose. The incongruous cascade of elegiac motifs on the epic scene foreshadows the ultimate destruction of Hannibal in exactly the same way as his Proteus, in *Punica* 7, concludes a humorously elegiac "Judgment of Paris" with a prophecy of victory at Zama. The poet makes clear by the strong verb *frangebat*[63] that Teuthras' song to the strains of his lyre has achieved Hannibal's moral dissolution, as we saw above (Sil. 11.481–482).

5. *Conclusions*

Punica 11 does not end with Hannibal's second Capuan banquet but in Carthage where Mago's demands for military supplies are fiercely opposed by the Barcids' enemy Hanno, whose speech is a prophecy of the Roman tenacity that will win the war:

> uos ego, uos metuo, Cannae. submittite signa
> atque adeo temptate, agendum, ac deposcite pacem:
> non dabitur. (Sil. 11.574–576)
>
> It is Cannae, Cannae that I fear. Lower your standards, or rather, make haste to sue for peace and demand it. You will not get it.

Hanno's peroration might be paraphrased as follows: "Peace is man's greatest gift. Peace is stronger than countless triumphs. Peace has the power to preserve stable government. May peace return to Carthage and may her reputation for treachery be wiped out for ever" (11.592–597). As leader of the opposition to Hannibal's Italian campaign, Hanno's high-minded praise of peace represents the views of the Carthaginian nobility who doubted the success of war with Rome and mistrusted the war-mongering Barcids. Once

---

62 Cf. Ov. *Rem.* 753: *eneruant animos citharae lotosque lyraeque* ("harps, pipes and lyres diminish manly spirit"). Cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.6.10; Prop. 4.6.32.

63 Cf. Stat. *Silu.* 5.3.194: *Aeaciden alio frangebat carmine Chiron* ("Chiron softened Aeacides with a different tune").

again Silius makes poetic capital out of historical fact by transferring to the Carthaginian leadership acrimoniously divergent opinions, echoes of *bellum ciuile* and the divisions in the high command, which contributed to Roman defeats in the first half of the *Punica*.[64]

With Hanno's final words, *fama fugetur ab urbe perfidiae, Phoenissa, tua* ("[Let us] banish the reproach of treachery from Dido's city," 11.596–597), the poet recapitulates his opening theme, the violation of *fides* and *foedera* which drives Capys' descendant, Decius, to defy Hannibal before the banquet. At the same feast, as a consequence of Decius' condemnation, Perolla plots Hannibal's assassination. Within his double banquet sequence Silius interweaves two divergent strands of Flavian political ideology, the evils of tyrannical abuse of power and the dangers of *luxuria*. These are colorfully delineated in Hannibal's red-faced fury, which is soon dissipated when he views the wealth of his new ally, and, later, in his whole-hearted surrender to the decadence of his adopted city. At the center of each feast Teuthras sings a song of contextual relevance artfully contained in the homonym *fides*: in the first song, Loyalty, which the Capuans owe to Rome, and in the second, the Lyre, which has the power to conquer Hannibal. The implicit warning, however, goes unheeded by the self-indulgent tyrant, confirming Pindar's belief that Apollo's lyre and the blessings of harmonious conviviality lie beyond the comprehension of Titans, tyrants, and Carthaginians.

64 See Marks (2010a) 143–144 and n. 45 for intertextual allusions to Lucan in Silius' Capua narrative.

MERVIT DEVS ESSE VIDERI: SILIUS' HOMER IN HOMER'S *PUNICA* 13*

Michiel van der Keur

Silius Italicus' *Punica* is a very Roman epic. From the outset, the poet presents his work as the "sequel" of Virgil's *Aeneid*, the national epic, when he declares his intention to sing the *gloria Aeneadum* (1.1–2). This essentially Roman quality of the *Punica*, as opposed to the contemporary epics with Greek subjects, Valerius' *Argonautica* and Statius' *Thebaid* and *Achilleid*, raises the question how the Flavian poet positions himself in the wider epic tradition with its rich Greek past. A promising starting point for any discussion of the way in which Silius engages with his literary predecessors is a passage in *Punica* 13, which features the father of epic poetry, Homer himself, as a character. In his inspection of the shades of the Underworld, guided by the *umbra* of the ancient Sibyl of Cumae, the protagonist Scipio views the ghost of Homer, which elicits a eulogy of the latter's poetic merits. The scene is set in a broader encounter with Greek ghosts, among whom the shades of Alexander the Great and the heroes of the *Iliad*. The entire passage arguably invites comparison between Greeks and Romans, be they heroes or poets.

The encomium of Homer is prompted by Scipio's remark that the Greek poet looks like a god to him:

> 'non falleris;' inquit
> docta comes Triuiae 'meruit deus esse uideri,
> et fuit in tanto non paruum pectore numen.
> carmine complexus terram, mare, sidera, manes
> et cantu Musas et Phoebum aequauit honore.
> atque haec cuncta, prius quam cerneret, ordine terris
> prodidit ac uestram tulit usque ad sidera Troiam.'
> Scipio perlustrans oculis laetantibus umbram
> 'si nunc fata darent, ut Romula facta per orbem
> hic caneret uates, quanto maiora futuros
> facta eadem intrarent hoc' inquit 'teste nepotes!
> felix Aeacide, cui tali contigit ore
> gentibus ostendi! creuit tua carmine uirtus.' (Sil. 13.785–797)

* I would like to thank the editor for organizing the inspiring conference at Delphi. I am also grateful to Harm-Jan van Dam for his comments and suggestions.

> "You are right," Trivia's learned companion replies, "he has deserved to seem a god, and no small deity housed in his great breast. With his poetry he encompassed earth, sea, stars and shades, and he equaled the Muses in song and Phoebus in glory. And all this, before he saw it, he revealed to the earth and he raised your Troy to heaven." Scipio looks with joyful eyes at the ghost and says: "If Fate would give that this poet now would sing Roman deeds throughout the world, how much greater those same deeds would come to our future descendants, if Homer testified to them! Blessed Achilles, whom it was granted to be shown to the world by such a voice! Your virtue has grown through his song."

In her enumeration of Homer's achievements, the Sibyl tells Scipio that the poet had revealed "all this" (*haec cuncta*, 790) to the world before he saw it. It is plausible that with "all this," she refers to the Underworld and its inhabitants, which Scipio has been viewing for the last three hundred lines. But since she comments upon Homer's poetic power, it is just as likely that this statement *also* relates, metapoetically, to Silius' debt to him for the *Nekyia* of which this is a part—Silius would not have written "all this," his account of the Underworld, but for *Odyssey* 11.[1]

That Silius here refers to Homer as the originator of his subject matter is corroborated by a few allusions to Lucretius, and more in particular to the passages where the didactic poet refers to his own "source," Epicurus, and defines the relation of his work to the epic tradition. The first of these allusions is found at 786 *meruit deus esse uideri*, which goes back to *merito nobis deus esse uidetur* ("he deservedly seems a god to us," Lucr. 5.19).[2] This praise is directed at Epicurus, the inspirator of the *De rerum natura*. A few lines later, Lucretius described his subject matter as the origins of *terram caelum mare sidera solem / lunaique globum* ("earth, sky, sea, and stars, the sun and the ball of the moon," 5.68–69). Silius draws upon this asyndetic list for Homer's reported subject matter *terram mare sidera manes* (13.788). The last item, *manes*, is a significant addition; not only is the Underworld the setting for Silius' praise, but it was precisely Lucretius who denied the Underworld its traditional place in the arrangement of the world. He did so in his first book, when he praised his predecessor Ennius for his poetic achievement, but simultaneously criticized him for his erroneous exposé of the *Acherusia templa*, the Underworld:

---

1 See also Reitz (1982) 117.

2 Hardie (1993) 115 thinks that Silius' use of past tenses suggests that Homer's poetic achievement was past and partial; but while the moment of his merits may lay in the past, it does not follow that they are exhausted by now. For *meruit*, the interpretation "has deserved" (against Duff's "deserved," adopted by Hardie) seems better.

> Ennius ut noster cecinit, qui primus amoeno
> detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam,
> per gentis Italas hominum quae clara clueret;
> etsi praeterea tamen esse Acherusia templa
> Ennius aeternis exponit uersibus edens …
> unde sibi exortam semper florentis Homeri
> commemorat speciem lacrimas effundere salsas
> coepisse et rerum naturam expandere dictis. (Lucr. 1.117–121 and 124–126)

> … as our own Ennius sang, who first brought down from pleasant Helicon a chaplet of evergreen leafage to win a glorious name through the nations of Italian men; although nevertheless he also sets forth in everlasting verses that there exist regions of Acheron … whence he avers that the likeness of ever deathless Homer issued forth and began to shed salt tears and to unfold the nature of things.

In this infernal context Lucretius alluded to the prologue of the *Annales*, where Homer's shade rises from that same Underworld to expound to Ennius the *rerum natura*—a remarkable way to refer to Ennius' inheritance of Homer's spirit and subject matter, which is in turn tied to Lucretius' own work. One might say that Lucretius, rejecting the veracity of the world view offered in epic poetry, claimed the explanation of the *rerum natura* for his own didactic poem (Lucr. 1.25).[3] Thus read, the reappearance of Homer's shade in Silius' passage, couched in Lucretian phrases, is the epicist's playful rebuff of this claim. But on another level, Silius and Lucretius are doing the same thing. Ennius had presented himself as the Roman counterpart of the Greek father of epic, just as Lucretius speaks with reverence of the Greek philosopher whose views *he* transports to Latin verses. Silius' allusions show that, more than anything, this passage is about Roman engagement with Greek example.

This theme was already prepared earlier in the *Nekyia*. In the preceding passages, Scipio met the ghosts of his parents and encountered the Roman consuls who had fallen in the war against Hannibal, along with other heroes of earlier wars against foreign oppressors and, contrasting, the ghost of Hamilcar, Hannibal's father. Then, at the transition from Roman shades to Greek ghosts, the Sibyl showed to Scipio the *decemuiri*, who were the first to bring Greek laws to Italy:

> exin designat uates, qui iura sub armis
> poscenti dederint populo primique petitas
> miscuerint Italis Piraeo litore leges. (Sil. 13.752–754)

3 Segal (1990) 262.

> Next the priestess points out the men who gave a constitution to the people which was demanding it in arms; they were the first to join laws sought from the shore of the Piraeus to Italian ones.

Silius' diction at 753–754 strongly reminds of the *primus ego* motif employed by other poets who claim they are the first to transpose a Greek genre to Latin, of which Lucretius' lines cited earlier are an example. Such claims are generally characterized by three elements: a) *primus* (or similar) in nominative case; b) a Greek name, often geographical; c) in many cases a form of *Italus*.[4] With his similar formulation, Silius thus prepared the way for a review of Greek models and, by implication, Roman successors. The entire parade of Greeks which follows, from Alexander to Castor, should be considered in this light.

The first of the Greek ghosts is that of Alexander the Great. Upon Scipio's request, the Macedonian advises him how to attain glory; we will return to this scene later. After a brief encounter with the shade of Croesus (13.776–777),[5] Scipio then discerns Homer's ghost as it approaches from Elysium. In the lines cited earlier, Scipio exclaims that he would wish for Homer to glorify Roman deeds, calling Achilles blessed to have him as his witness. It has been broadly recognized that this actually alludes to Alexander's similar outcry during his visit to the tomb of Achilles.[6] Cicero has recorded his sentiment in Latin as *o fortunate … adulescens, qui tuae uirtutis Homerum praeconem inueneris!* ("fortunate young man, to have gotten Homer as the herald of your *uirtus*!" *Arch.* 24). Scipio directly begins to follow Alexander's example by comparing himself to his model's model (and another Greek), Achilles.[7]

---

[4] Cf. Lucr. 1.117–119; Virg. *Ecl.* 6.1–2, *G.* 2.176 and 3.10–12; Hor. *Carm.* 3.30.13–14 and *Ep.* 1.19.23–24; Prop. 3.1.3–4. See also Bessone in this volume (pp. 220–221) for the inversion of the motif by Statius.

[5] Croesus is mainly presented as a contrast to Alexander to emphasize the importance of glory, which the meeting with Homer will explore from another angle. Croesus valued only earthly riches, none of which remained to him, whereas the immortal glory which Alexander sought ensured that even after death, he was the model general. The contrast remains subtle; I agree with Reitz (1982) 114 n. 4 that Kißel's interpretation of the pair of kings as the antithesis of *uoluptas* and *uirtus* (1979: 177–178) would go too far.

[6] For a full bibliography, see Marks (2005) 145 n. 84. On Alexander as a model, see also Fucecchi in this volume, pp. 305–324.

[7] Marks (2005) 145; see also Ripoll (2000) 162. It is significant that the phrase which describes Homer's poetic achievement—he "encompassed" the world with his song (*carmine complexus*, 788)—echoes an earlier description of Achilles; his shield also "encompassed" the entire world: *clipeo amplexus terramque polumque / maternumque fretum totumque*

But his words do not merely suggest that Scipio would be the Roman counterpart of Achilles (and Alexander); they also hint at a Roman equivalent of Homer, worthy to sing the *Romula facta* (793). The identity of this poet has been the subject of some discussion. Some have suggested that Silius here has Ennius in mind; after all, he was the poet who lived in Scipio's own age (and indeed figures as a character at 12.393–419, where he is eulogized by Apollo),[8] whose *Annales* included the history of Rome from the age of her founder (cf. *Romula*),[9] and who also wrote a *Scipio*, in which he would have said that only Homer could sing praises worthy of Scipio.[10] The entire setting here reminds of the prologue of the *Annales* (referred to in Lucretius' passage discussed above), in which the ghost of Homer appeared to Ennius in a dream to tell him that he was his Roman reincarnation.[11] It seems plausible that Silius adopts Ennian imagery here for the theme of Roman successorship, but this does not mean that Scipio's words are a veiled allusion to the archaic poet himself. Silius has already sung Ennius' praises in book 12.[12] Furthermore, if he had thought that Scipio had been adequately glorified by Ennius, there would have been little need for the *Punica*.[13]

A similar point could be made against the view that Virgil looms behind Scipio's words.[14] The relation with the Augustan poet is of course complex.

---

in imagine mundum, "bearing on his shield the earth and the heavens and his mother's ocean—the whole world in pictures" (7.121–122; trans. Littlewood [2011]). The description is part of a simile which depicts Hannibal as Achilles; the echo illustrates the rivalry which Silius establishes between Hannibal and Scipio in their claim to being the epic successor to Homer's protagonist. See also Karakasis in this volume, pp. 252–253.

8 Bettini (1977) 433 draws attention to *nunc* (793), although this point should not be pressed.

9 Manuwald (2007) 85.

10 Suda s.v. Ἔννιος: Σκιπίωνα γὰρ ᾄδων καὶ ἐπὶ μέγα τὸν ἄνδρα ἐξᾶραι βουλόμενός φησι μόνον ἂν Ὅμηρον ἐπαξίους ἐπαίνους εἰπεῖν Σκιπίωνος ("for singing about Scipio and wishing to exalt the man, he says that only Homer could praise Scipio adequately"). See von Albrecht (1964) 161 n. 45; Bettini (1977) 441; Kißel (1979) 180 n. 52; Spaltenstein (1990) 272; Marks (2005) 145 n. 84; Manuwald (2007) 85, comparing V. Max. 8.14.1 (on Scipio and Ennius). Manuwald (2007) 76–77 plausibly suggests that Ennius' *recusatio* is imitated at 12.387–389, where Silius expresses his inability to sing the battle-deeds of Ennius himself. On the encomium in book 12, see also Casali (2006) and Dorfbauer (2008).

11 Bettini (1977) 135 makes much of the supposed correspondence between Lucr. 1.124–125 and Homer's youthful and radiant appearance in Silius' Underworld (Sil. 13.778–780), arguing that the shade in the *Punica* is "l'Omero 'che sta per apparire' ad Ennio." I will return to Silius' description towards the end of this chapter.

12 Reitz (1982) 116 n. 4, who also points out (with Juhnke [1972] 291) that there, Ennius is compared to Hesiod, not Homer.

13 Kißel (1979) 180; cf. Manuwald (2007) 77.

14 Hardie (2004) 152–153.

Virgilian echoes resonate through the entire *Punica*, including this *Nekyia*. Moreover, in his homage to Mantua, Virgil's place of birth, Silius puts it on par with Homer's native country, which it rivals in poetic power (8.594). The Augustan poet would be the prime candidate to be Homer's Roman counterpart. Then again, in this passage Silius seems to emphasize Virgil's debt to Homer, rather than their rivalry. It is a subtle touch that it is the ghost of the *Virgilian* Sibyl who is Silius' mouthpiece here. Homer is said to have raised Troy to the stars (*tulit usque ad sidera Troiam*, 791). In the *Aeneid*, this is Aeneas' mission (*ingentem factis fer ad aethera Troiam*, "by your deeds exalt Troy in greatness unto heaven!" Virg. *Aen.* 3.462); thus, by contrast, Silius states that Homer had done so already. Suppressing his own debt to Virgil here, the Flavian poet actually presents himself as the *Romanus Homerus*.[15] Or, in less agonistic phrasing, Silius is the new Homer exactly because he is also the new Virgil; his status of epic successor to Virgil includes his incorporation of Virgil's (and Ennius') quality of being the Roman Homer. That this passage implies a self-conscious assertion is suggested not only by the correspondences with Lucretius, but also by another intertext, which again draws upon Alexander's words on Achilles and Homer.

The visit of the Macedonian king to the site of Troy is imitated by Lucan's Caesar in the *Bellum Ciuile* (Luc. 9.961–999). Both Alexander and Caesar are interested in the fame of the Iliadic warriors, fame which, Lucan is quick to mention, they owed to their poets: *multum debentis uatibus umbras* (9.963). Lucan recognized the potential of the scene for programmatic self-reference, comparing the ruined state of Troy with the immortal fame of its prior inhabitants. He then promises Caesar:

> ... si quid Latiis fas est promittere Musis,
> quantum Zmyrnaei durabunt uatis honores,
> uenturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra
> uiuet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aeuo. (Luc. 9.983–986)

> ... if for Latian muses it is right to promise anything,
> as long as honors of the Smyrnaean bard endure,
> the future ages will read me and you; our Pharsalia
> shall live and we shall be condemned to darkness by no era.

15 Kißel (1979) 180; Reitz (1982) 117; Deremetz (1995) 473; Manuwald (2007) 86. Cf. also 4.525–528, where Silius adapts the Homeric motif of the "many mouths" to play with the thought of impersonating the Greek poet.

The motif that Lucan employs, of connecting the endurance of his poetic achievement to that of something else, is not new. We need only think of Virgil's eulogy of Euryalus and Nisus (*Aen.* 9.446–449) or Horace's famous *Carmen* 3.30 (7–9), where the immortality of the poem or poet is tied to the stability of the Roman state.[16] Notably, that is what Lucan chose *not* to do—logically so, since his poem is about the *destruction* of that Roman state.[17] He rather compares his fame to that of Homer, and thus presents his work, a product of Latin Muses, as the Roman counterpart of Homer's Greek epics, ignoring Virgil—as if Lucan wished to state that *this*, rather than the *Aeneid* which is its opposite, is how a true Roman epic should be. Returning to the *Punica*, we see that the same emulation of Greek exploits is also present here.[18] Silius takes his cue from Lucan and creates his own imitation of Alexander's words to state his poetic program.[19] Scipio is established as an epic hero, like Achilles, but in the style of Alexander,[20] while Silius simultaneously hints at his own status of Roman successor to Homer's epic.

So far, we have found how Silius positions himself as a Roman poet in the tradition of a Greek epic genre; but we may tease out a few more nuances from this rich passage. Cicero's *Pro Archia*, in which Alexander's words are cited, extols the immortalizing power of poetry;[21] Lucan's passage similarly revolves around the timeless quality of song. Silius' encomium of Homer combines his self-presentation with a series of other implicit references to conventional topoi on the value of poetry, especially regarding the immortality that it has and bestows.

The first topos is that of poetry as a monument—best known from the aforementioned *Carmen* of Horace, but present throughout Latin poetry from Ennius on.[22] While kings commemorate their deeds through buildings and monuments, these will crumble with time; poetry, on the other hand,

---

16 Lucan closely follows Virgil's sentence structure, diction and number of lines. Wick (2003) 419 also adduces Ov. *Am.* 1.15.25–26, *Met.* 15.876–879 and V. Fl. 2.244–246.

17 Wick (2003) 418–419. In his similarly self-referential eulogy of three brothers at 4.396–400 (a close imitation of Virg. *Aen.* 9.446–449), Silius hints at the later political instability that will be Lucan's subject.

18 Unlike Lucan, however, Silius does not brush Virgil aside; see above.

19 The comparison with Lucan is also made by Manuwald (2007) 86–87. Like Lucan, Silius picks up Virgil's programmatic eulogy, namely by beginning his line with *felix Aeacide* in imitation of *fortunati ambo* (Virg. *Aen.* 9.446).

20 Cf. Deremetz (1995) 471 and Marks (2005) 143.

21 The significance of the context is emphasized by Ripoll (2000) 162.

22 Hor. *Carm.* 3.30.1; cf. also, e.g., Enn. *Ann.* 404–406 Skutsch; Virg. *G.* 3.10–48; Prop. 3.2.17–26; Ov. *Met.* 15.871–872.

lives on forever. We have seen the same theme in Lucan, with the contrast between Troy's ruins and its poetic fame.[23] Now one might object that Silius does not make mention of monuments here, and that is true. But there is a poetic monument hidden in intertextuality. When Scipio expresses his hope that Homer would sing of Roman deeds "throughout the world" (*ut Romula facta per orbem hic caneret uates*), he echoes a famous passage in *Aeneid* 1, namely Aeneas' viewing of the images on the temple of Juno in Carthage. These depict the Trojan war (i.e., the *Iliad*), which is described as *bellaque iam fama totum uulgata per orbem* ("sung over the whole world," Virg. *Aen.* 1.457); Virgil is undoubtedly making a metapoetic nod to the epic tradition, and more particularly to his model Homer.[24] The phrase *canere per orbem* is part of a whole nexus of statements by Virgil himself and other poets about the future of their own poetry; compare only the hopes expressed by Virgil and Ovid at *Ecl.* 8.9–10 (*liceat totum mihi ferre per orbem … tua carmina*, "shall I be ever free to spread your songs throughout the world") and *Am.* 1.3.25 (*per totum … cantabimur orbem*, "we shall be sung … through all the earth").[25] In *Aeneid* 1, *iam uulgata per orbem* would then refer to Homer's already celebrated epic; when Aeneas inspects the images of his fellow Trojans and of the Greeks, he actually reviews Homer's cast of characters. Now Scipio will do the same immediately after his encounter with the shade of Homer; for directly afterwards, the ghosts of the warriors of the *Iliad* are paraded:[26]

23 The contrast is emphasized at Luc. 9.964: *exustae nomen memorabile Troiae* ("a memorable name—burned-out Troy"). See Zeitlin (2001) 238 and Wick (2003) 116.

24 Barchiesi (1997) 273 maintains that it refers to the whole epic Cycle (*orbem*), which is "trite" (*uulgata*). It should be noted, however, that while the murals depict scenes from the epic Cycle (1.488–493, the figures of Memnon and Penthesilea), the line which immediately follows 1.457 as an illustration (*Atridas Priamumque et saeuum ambobus Achillem*) is the shortest possible summary of the *Iliad*: Achilles' wrath and vengeance (cf. Barchiesi [1999] 333 n. 13).

25 Cf. also on Ennius *Ann.* 12–13 Skutsch and Lucr. 1.119; Virgil on himself at *G.* 2.176; Ovid on Callimachus at *Am.* 1.15.13, on Sappho at *Her.* 15.28, and on himself at *Am.* 1.15.7–8, *Ars* 2.740 and *Tr.* 4.10.59–60; Martial on himself at 1.1.2. Silius' description of Regulus' deeds in the First Punic War as *magna et totum uulgata per orbem* (Sil. 6.122, a close imitation of Virgil's words) may be a reference to Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*, just like the murals of the temple at Liternum which depict the same war (6.653–697; see Fowler [2000] 96–97, Harrison [2010] 287 n. 35).

26 At 800, Thilo's conjecture *inuicto* replaces the mss. reading *ire uiro* (printed by Delz), which would go with *accipit* in the preceding line. *ire* with a dative (*uiro*) would mean to "move towards" (cf. 15.327), whereas we here need the sense "accompany" (cf. 13.782–783: *multaeque sequuntur / mirantes animae et laeto clamore frequentant*, "and many souls follow him [Homer] in adoration and accompany him with happy cries"). In the lines as cited above, the adjective assigned to Achilles now balances Hector's epithet at the end of the line; while it also results in the loss of a reference to Homer, the transition from poet to retinue is implied in

> sed, quae tanta adeo gratantum turba, requirens,
> heroum effigies maioresque accipit umbras.
> inuicto stupet Aeacide, stupet Hectore magno
> Aiacisque gradum uenerandaque Nestoris ora
> miratur, geminos adspectat laetus Atridas
> iamque Ithacum corde aequantem Peleia facta. (Sil. 13.798–803)
>
> But when Scipio inquires after that great host of grateful spirits, he learns that they are the images of heroes and ghosts from long past. He marvels at Achilles the invincible, at great Hector, and wonders at the strides of Ajax and the venerable voice of Nestor, and looks with delight upon the two sons of Atreus and now upon the man from Ithaca, who equaled with his craftiness Achilles' deeds.

Scipio "marvels" (*stupet*) at Achilles and Hector, the same word that Virgil uses for Aeneas' viewing of the images (Virg. *Aen.* 1.495).[27] The epithets that Silius gives to these warriors remind of their counterparts in the *Iliad*.[28] Indeed, the list itself seems a reference to both Homeric epics: Achilles, protagonist of the *Iliad*, is named first, while Odysseus, hero of the *Odyssey*, comes last; he is called *Ithacus*, reminding of his νόστος, and he "equaled with his mind the deeds of Achilles," where "equaled" points at their shared status of main protagonist and *corde* hints at πολύτροπον (Hom. *Od.* 1.1).[29] These Iliadic heroes are primarily literary characters; both Aeneas and Scipio look at images of their Homeric counterparts.[30] It seems significant that Silius

---

gratantum ("grateful ghosts"). The epithet *inuictus* also underscores the parallelism between Achilles and Scipio; Silius picks up Ennius' address *Scipio inuicte* (*Var.* 3 Vahlen) at 17.651 (*salue, inuicte parens*).

27 Cf. also Virg. *Aen.* 1.456 *miratur* ~ Sil. 13.802 *miratur* and *Aen.* 1.453 *lustrat* ~ Sil. 13.792 *perlustrans*.

28 Cf. Juhnke (1972) 291 and Ripoll (2001) 99 n. 50; for great Hector, cf. μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ (e.g., *Il.* 2.816) and Ἕκτορά … μέγαν (*Il.* 11.57); for Ajax' strides, cf. μακρὰ βιβάς at *Il.* 7.213 (admittedly not strictly an epithet, but it is a defining scene); for Nestor, cf. e.g., *Il.* 1.247–248: Νέστωρ ἡδυεπὴς; for the phrase on Odysseus, *corde aequantem Peleia facta*, cf. especially *Il.* 19.217–219 (κρείσσων εἰς ἐμέθεν καὶ φέρτερος οὐκ ὀλίγον περ / ἔγχει, ἐγὼ δὲ κε σεῖο νοήματι γε προβαλοίμην / πολλόν, "better are you than I and mightier not a little with the spear, but in counsel I would surpass you by far").

29 Achilles' *facta* are also *epic* deeds; Scipio, in his wish that Homer would commemorate *Romula facta* (793), similarly asks for an epic. For the meta-epic connotations of *facta* as the subject of heroic poetry and, thus, a reference to epic poetry itself, see Tipping (2010a) 156 n. 74.

30 Reitz (1982) 119; Ripoll (2001) 98. Whether or not Aeneas in his subjective, cautiously optimistic viewing is misreading the images (see e.g., Stanley [1965] 273–277; Horsfall [1973–1974] 7–8; Johnson [1976] 103–105) is not really relevant to this discussion. What makes Aeneas' viewing of the images (like that of Silius' Hannibal at Liternum, see n.25) problematic is their being art in a hostile setting, whereas Scipio's viewing takes place in a more neutral

uses the word *effigies* for them, which in most other instances in the *Punica* means "image" or "statue"; it is the same word that Virgil uses in *Aeneid* 3 for *parua Troia* in Buthrotum, his other reproduction of Homer's Troy.[31] Silius calls the ghosts *maiores*, that is, from a remote past, but also characters of an older poet.[32] But not only the viewing of these ghosts itself, but also its setting is similar to Aeneas' viewing of the relief. Just as for Virgil's hero in *Aeneid* 1, this is Scipio's first major appearance in the poem; book 13 is the first of the last five books in which he will be center stage. Both heroes first review images of the Homeric characters before setting out to do their own epic deeds.[33]

This point of viewing and reviewing may be pressed somewhat further. Silius stresses visual aspects in this scene. Naturally, some of them are inherent to the form of the *Nekyia*, which is all about a hero viewing people from the past (and the future). But Homer's merits are phrased in terms of visibility as well. Achilles is called blessed because he was "shown to the world" by Homer—*cui … contigit … gentibus ostendi* (Sil. 13.796–797). This phrase echoes a Virgilian line on the young Marcellus in *Aeneid* 6, a figure who stood model for Silius' Homer, as others have convincingly demonstrated.[34] Virgil's Anchises laments that Marcellus will "only be shown to the world" before death will take him (*ostendent terris hunc tantum fata*, "only a glimpse will fate give earth," Virg. *Aen.* 6.869). By contrast, Achilles is here called blessed for the same thing, for being "shown to the nations"—by a poet like Homer.

---

context, the Underworld. Unlike Aeneas, Scipio reacts to his viewing of the Greek heroes with unreserved joy (*laetus*, 802); obviously, he regards them as literary characters, not as the ghosts of his Trojan ancestors' enemies. The correspondence between his joy at sighting the poet (*oculis laetantibus*, 792) and that of the Iliadic warriors (*laeto clamore*, 783) emphasizes Scipio's own status as a literary character. The scene revolves, far more explicitly than in Virgil, primarily around the reception of Homeric epic.

31 Virg. *Aen.* 3.497–498: *effigiem Xanthi Troiamque uidetis / quam uestrae fecere manus* ("You see a copy of Xanthus and a Troy, which your own hands have built").

32 Perhaps we should also allow for the sense "greater," indicating the Flavian poet's reverence for his great Greek model. Similarly, Silius presents the Sibyl, who is the ghost of Virgil's Sibyl, as *maiori uate* at 13.409.

33 A poignant parallel may be found in Stat. *Ach.* 1.864–865, where the young Achilles looks at the shield that had been put before him and sees his own reflection: *luxque aemula uultum / reddidit et simili talem se uidit in auro* ("the rival radiance gave back his face and he saw himself as he was in the gold likeness"). Statius' Achilles views his Homeric self before assuming his epic role of participant in the Trojan war; *aemula* emphasizes the poet's emulative successorship; see Sfyroeras' discussion in this volume, p. 245.

34 See Reitz (1982) 116; Grebe (1989) 116–118; and Hardie (2004) 152 n. 9, focusing on the descriptions of both shades (*Aen.* 6.860–866 ~ Sil. 13.778–785).

Silius suggests that poets make all the difference; indeed, perhaps Marcellus should also be called blessed for having a Virgil. Significantly, Alexander is shown to Scipio with the same word (*ostendens*, Sil. 13.762), and in his praise for Homer, Silius presents the poet himself for inspection by Scipio, and the reader; Homer himself is also an *effigies* (13.779).

The second topos to be discussed is another image for poetic immortality. The Sibyl notes that Homer "raised your Troy to heaven." This is what poets do; in the similar eulogy of Ennius in book 12, Apollo foretells that the Roman poet "shall raise leaders to heaven" (*attollet duces caelo*, 12.411).[35] But more significantly, it also echoes Silius' own programmatic statement in the first lines of the epic *ordior arma, quibus caelo se gloria tollit / Aeneadum* ("here I begin the war by which the fame of the Aeneadae is raised to heaven," 1.1–2). Silius is doing for Rome what Homer had done for Troy, so Scipio's request for a poet is already being fulfilled.[36]

This is tied to the hero's own quest for fame. It is no coincidence that Scipio immediately links Homer's praise for Troy with his praise for the hero, Achilles. Just over a hundred lines earlier, the ghost of Scipio's mother spurred him on to raise himself to heaven with his deeds: *nec in caelum dubites te attollere factis* (13.635). The parallel with the opening lines is obvious; the glory of the whole nation culminates in the glory of the individual hero, Scipio.[37] This move is taken from the *Aeneid*. As we saw before, Aeneas was exhorted to raise Troy to the sky with his deeds at *Aen.* 3.462 (*ingentem factis fer ad aethera Troiam*); likewise he was incited to seek glory for himself at *Aen.* 6.806 (*et dubitamus adhuc uirtutem extendere factis*, "and do we still hesitate to make known our *uirtus* by exploits") which is the model for the admonition of Scipio's mother.[38] The phrase *uirtutem extendere* literally suggests an augmentation of virtue through *facta*, that is, epic deeds (see n.29 above), which returns here as well: Achilles' *uirtus* has grown (*uirtus tua carmine creuit*, 13.797), and Homer's epics are responsible for that. While in Virgil it is the epic hero who is tasked with garnering fame for his

---

[35] Cf. also Statius on himself at *Silu.* 5.3.10–11 (*ego magnanimum qui facta attollere regum / ibam*, "I who would exalt the deeds of greatsouled kings").

[36] Reitz (1982) 117 and Tipping (2010a) 174. Given the meta-epic sense of *arma*, we might also consider the opening line as a self-conscious statement: "I begin the *epic* by which the fame of the Aeneadae is raised to heaven."

[37] It is significant that at Scipio's meeting with Alexander, the Roman in search of glory is identified as *Aeneades* (13.767), another reference to the proem; see also Tipping (2010a) 170 and (2010b) 205.

[38] Marks (2005) 93 n. 81.

country and himself, Silius credits Homer with glorifying Troy and Achilles; against Virgil's *factis*, Silius puts *carmine*.[39] His Scipio recognizes the hero's debt to his poet.[40]

But perhaps the phrasing "raise to heaven" should be taken a bit more literally. The poet does not only grant immortal fame; sometimes, he also promises actual apotheosis. Ennius' Jupiter foretells the deification of Romulus: *unus erit quem tu* [*sc.* Mars] *tolles in caerula caeli / templa* ("There will be one man whom you shall raise to the blue regions of heaven," Enn. *Ann.* 54–55 Skutsch);[41] likewise, Aeneas' ascension to divinity is predicted at *Aen.* 1.259–260: *sublimemque feres ad sidera caeli / magnanimum Aenean* ("and great-souled Aeneas you will raise on high to the starry heaven"). A similar apotheosis is outlined to Scipio in book 15 by the goddess Virtus. She tells him that the gate of heaven stands open (*caeli porta patet*) to those who have honored their divine roots, and she invites him to seek out her house, located upon a high hill, from where he may look down at other mortals.[42] The echoes of Ennius and Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* have long been recognized and need no further discussion here.[43] At Sil. 15.78–83, Virtus cites as

---

39 The *Punica* also illustrates how song can destroy *uirtus*, namely in Teuthras' enfeeblement of Hannibal in book 11; see Littlewood in this volume, pp. 267–285.

40 As do Homer's own characters, who are grateful (*gratantum*, 13.798). Marks (2010c) 194 contrasts 13.797 with 15.275–276, where Scipio's *continentia* is positively contrasted with the practice of Homer's Agamemnon and Achilles. I do not share Marks' extreme view that Silius promotes historical epic with its Roman moral *exempla* at the expense of Homer's Greek mythological *Iliad* ("Scipio … errs in admiring Achilles' epic *fama*"). While the theme of superior Roman emulation is certainly present, Homer's poetic power, which is never in question, is central to this passage.

41 Skutsch (1985) 205 remarks that "Romulus apparently was not a god before Ennius made him one"; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.8.13–24 on Ennius' *Calabrae Pierides*, who honored Scipio and Romulus with a place in heaven (*dignum laude uirum Musa uetat mori, / caelo Musa beat*, "If a man is worthy of praise, the Muse does not let him die; the Muse bestows the bliss of heaven," 28–29). See further Suerbaum (1968) 217–218.

42 *quis aetherii seruatur seminis ortus, / caeli porta patet* ("the gate of heaven stands open to those who have preserved the divine element born with them," 15.77–78) and *casta mihi domus et celso stant colle penates; / ardua saxoso perducit semita cliuo … mox celsus ab alto / infra te cernes hominum genus* ("My household is pure; my dwelling is set on a lofty hill, and a steep track leads there by a rocky ascent … Soon you will gain the height and look down upon mankind below you," 15.101–103, 106–107). This high home of Virtus ultimately goes back to Hesiod's description of Ἀρετή in *Op.* 289–292, which can only be reached by a long and steep path. Compare furthermore the high abode of the wise, such as portrayed by Lucretius and others, from where the wise man may similarly look down upon the errors of others (cf. e.g., Lucr. 2.8–9; *Ciris* 14; Ov. *Met.* 15.147–152; Stat. *Silu.* 2.2.131–132; Sen. *Ep.* 82.4–5).

43 See von Albrecht (1964) 164; Heck (1970); Ripoll (2000) 164–170. A few main points of contact are *Rep.* 6.29 (*ipsa uirtus trahat ad uerum decus*, "Virtue herself … should lead you on

parallels Hercules, Bacchus, the Dioscuri and Romulus, who all were mortal sons of a god and who had earned godhood. Hercules, Bacchus and Castor and Pollux were all benefactors of mankind; as such, they were the prime examples in antiquity of mortals who ascended to heaven through their services.[44] The advice of Scipio's mother to reach for heaven is to be connected with Virtus' speech,[45] as it anticipates such an apotheosis through *uirtus*. She motivates her advice by disclosing Scipio's divine parentage to him (13.637–647); he is the son of Jupiter, who had come to her in the form of a serpent. With this divine birth, Scipio meets the profile of the candidates for apotheosis; he has *caelestia semina* (15.71). Scipio is thus admonished to perform similar great deeds for his country, after which the reward of heaven will be his.[46]

The concept of apotheosis through merit is relevant to the present discussion because of a second anticipation of Virtus' heaven, which is found in Scipio's dialogue with Alexander. Scipio seeks guidance on the path his mother has set him on. Alexander is perfectly suited to be his guide, since he himself is the true son of Ammon-Zeus: *Libyci certissima proles Hammonis* (13.767–768).[47] Scipio asks him which is the road to glory: *uia … ad*

---

to true glory"), followed by Scipio Aemulianus' response at 6.30 that he will try hard *si quidem bene meritis de patria quasi limes ad caeli aditum patet* ("if indeed a path to heaven, as it were, is open to those who have served their country well"); cf. also 6.17. Also in the *Republic* (fr. 2 Powell = Enn. *Var.* 23–24 Vahlen), Cicero quotes the words of Ennius' Scipio to which Silius' Virtus alludes: *si fas endo plagas caelestum ascendere cuiquam est, / mi soli caeli maxima porta patet* ("If fate let man ascend to heavenly heights / To me alone the great gates open wide"). For Silius and Cicero, see also Fucecchi in this volume, pp. 306–307.

44 Anderson (1928) 7 n. 1 quotes Cic. *N. D.* 2.62, *Leg.* 2.19, *Tusc.* 1.27–28; Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.9–36, *Ep.* 2.1.5–17; at Hor. *Carm.* 4.8.29–34, the same demigods are the parallels for Ennius' deification of Romulus. Stoic beliefs had shaped Roman thought in this matter; after Ennius' example of Romulus / Quirinus, the possibility of earning godhood through service to mankind was translated to all great Romans. See Billerbeck (1986a) 346 and (1986b) 3132 n. 81, who also mentions Cic. *Sest.* 143, *Fin.* 2.118 and 3.66, *Off.* 3.25, and *Tusc.* 1.32.

45 Cf. Ripoll (1998) 80; Marks (2005) 35; Klaassen (2010) 123–125. Scipio's mother also has the same place of honor in Elysium as Leda and Alcmene, the mothers of the Dioscuri and Hercules (13.632–633), and in the closing lines of the epic, when Scipio is victorious over Carthage, he is likened to Bacchus, Hercules, Quirinus and Camillus, who is also conspicuous for his *meritis* (17.647–652).

46 We may now reinterpret *Romula facta* as a reference to Romulus' apotheosis-through-poetry (i.e. in the *Annales*), which Scipio also sought. Tipping's view ([2010a] 174 and [2010b] 208–209) that the phrase evokes Romulus' fratricide and thus problematizes Scipio's wish for the glorification of Rome, seems less likely.

47 Silius thus presents an Alexander who is radically different from Lucan's negative model for Caesar (*Pellaei proles uaesana Philippi*, "the crazy offspring of Pellaean Philip," Luc. 10.20), which may in turn be influenced by Seneca's critique of Alexander (Sen. *Ben.* 1.13.2–3) as

decus et summas laudum … arces ("path to eminence and the topmost pinnacle of achievement," 13.770–771); the last word hints at Virtus' high abode.[48] Alexander replies that Scipio must be daring in his pursuit of the war, for *pigra extulit astris haud umquam sese uirtus* ("slow *uirtus* has never raised itself to the stars", 13.773–774). Glory is thus again linked to *uirtus*, which is the way to heaven. The meeting with Alexander is thus all about the hero's quest for immortal fame, and presumably apotheosis. It is no coincidence that the scene is immediately followed by the encounter with Homer; in effect, Silius comments that in his quest for fame, the hero must look to his poet, for it is he who grants this form of immortality to his characters.[49] Scipio recognizes that when he gives Homer credit for Achilles' grandeur.

But not only the hero, but also the poet becomes immortal.[50] Scipio's statement that Homer looks like a god to him matches Silius' description of him a few lines earlier:

> atque hic Elysio tendentem limite cernens
> effigiem iuuenis, caste cui uitta ligabat
> purpurea effusos per colla nitentia crines:
> 'dic,' ait 'hic quinam, uirgo? nam luce refulget
> praecipua frons sacra uiro, multaeque sequuntur
> mirantes animae et laeto clamore frequentant …' (Sil. 13.778–783)

> And now, seeing a shade moving along the path from Elysium whose hair, flowing over his shining shoulders, was chastely bound with a purple fillet, the young man says: "Tell me, maiden, who is this man? For his sacred brow shines with a special light, and many souls follow him in adoration and accompany him with happy cries …"

The poet is portrayed with long flowing hear and shining shoulders, he has purple fillets and radiates a remarkable light. This description associates

---

uesanus adulescens, who cannot stand comparison to deified Hercules. Silius' and Lucan's phrases are very much alike in construction, with opposite implications; see Cresci Marrone (1983–1984) 92. This is one argument against the view that Alexander is a disturbing exemplar for Scipio, given his negative presentation by Lucan and others, for which see Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2551–2552; Tipping (2010a) 172 and (2010b) 207; *contra*, see Marks (2005) 143 and Fucecchi in this volume, pp. 305–324.

48 The phrase *summas … arces* may be intertextual with *Ciris* 14 (*mihi iam summas sapientia panderet arces*, "wisdom now opened up to me her topmost citadels") which is a parallel for Silius' description of Virtus' home (see n.42). Furthermore, the road (*uia*) corresponds to the path (*semita*, Sil. 15.102) leading to her elevated dwelling, which houses also *Honor*, *Laudes*, *Gloria* and *Decus* (15.98–99), two of which return here.

49 The relationship is of course reciprocal; the hero provides the poet with material for song, i.e., *facta*.

50 For the shared immortality of the bard and his characters, see also Hardie (1993) 100–101.

Homer with deities, and especially with Bacchus.[51] Note the verbal echoes of 7.194–196, where Bacchus manifests his godhood to the rustic Falernus: *inde nitentem / lumine purpureo frontem cinxere corymbi | et fusae per colla comae* ("Then ivy crowned his brow that shone with a gleaming light and his hair flowed down over his shoulders"). Furthermore, *luce refulget* echoes descriptions of Venus and of Aeneas when he is infused with divine splendor;[52] and in this same book Jupiter similarly shone with a *luce corusca* (13.640) when he visited Scipio's mother.

Homer is thus very much like a god. But we should not forget the other half of Scipio's remark: "I would easily have mistaken him for a god, if he would not be in the Stygian darkness" (*quem, si Stygia non esset in umbra, / dixissem facile esse deum*, 13.784–785). Homer is dead, then, after all. Is his divine appearance only a façade? The better answer would be that Homer is both immortal *and* dead. Consider the famous epitaph of Ennius (*uolito uiuos per ora uirum*, "Alive, I fly on the lips of men", *Var*. 18 Vahlen) or Horace's *non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei uitabit Libitinam* ("I shall not wholly die, and a large part of me will elude the Goddess of Death," *Carm*. 3.30.6–7).[53] But after this long parade of Latin authors, let us finally turn to Homer himself, as his own *Nekyia* is where the best parallel is found for the convergence of mortality and immortality.

That Silius uses *Odyssey* 11 is obvious; he follows the structure of Homer's book more closely, however, than has been noted by most critics.[54] A close analysis is not feasible here, of course, but a very brief comparison of the interlocutors of Odysseus and Scipio may illustrate the point. Both heroes first meet an unburied companion, then a sage who predicts their personal future and next the deceased mother of the hero.[55] In the *Punica*, she is followed by Scipio's father and uncle. Silius thus combines Odysseus' mother and Aeneas' father; the elder Scipio has more traits, however, of the next conversational partner in *Odyssey* 11, namely Agamemnon,[56] who is the first

51 For the purple fillets associated with Bacchus, cf. Stat. *Silu*. 2.7.9 and *Ach*. 1.611.

52 Venus: Virg. *Aen*. 2.590; Aeneas: *Aen*. 1.588–589.

53 Cf. also Ov. *Am*. 1.15.41–42, *Met*. 15.875–876; see Suerbaum (1968) 168–169 and esp. 336–337.

54 This is interwoven with a profound engagement with Aeneas' *katabasis* (see e.g., Reitz [1982] and Klaassen [2010] 113–126), but that is not the focus of this chapter.

55 Elpenor (Hom. *Od*. 11.51–83) ~ Appius Claudius (Sil. 13.445–487); Teiresias (*Od*. 11.90–151) ~ the Sibyl (Sil. 13.494–516, followed by a description of the Underworld by the Sibyl); Antikleia (*Od*. 11.152–224) ~ Pomponia (Sil. 13.613–649).

56 Hom. *Od*. 11.387–466, Sil. 13.650–704. Both meetings begin with a failed embrace, and both ghosts tell the story of their own death. Agamemnon was killed after his wife betrayed

of three warriors from the *Iliad* who speak with Odysseus. Likewise, father Scipio is followed by two other warriors. The first is Paulus, the Roman commander who was killed at Cannae. Scipio's conversation with him is modeled after Odysseus' meeting with Achilles, the second warrior in *Odyssey* 11.[57] We then encounter Hamilcar, the ghost of the enemy; the obvious model for him is Ajax, who is as hostile to Odysseus as Hamilcar is to Scipio.[58] But Hamilcar does speak to Scipio, and it emerges that Silius with a masterful stroke has combined Homer's Ajax *and* Achilles as models for his Hamilcar, who is told about the deeds of his son Hannibal and departs triumphantly, like Achilles after the news of his son Neoptolemus.[59]

After all these conversations both poets devote most of the remainder of their *Nekyia* to catalogues of various types of ghosts; in both poems only *one* more ghost steps forward to speak to the protagonist. In the *Punica*, this is Alexander; in the *Odyssey*, it is the ghost of Heracles. Heracles is in many ways a model for the man who views him; like Odysseus, he returned from the Underworld, but was also continuously tormented by labors.[60] Similarly, Alexander acts as a model for Scipio;[61] the likeness with Heracles is easily seen, as both wandered the earth and were fathered by the supreme god himself.[62] But I would posit that Heracles is *also* a model for Silius' Homer. We have seen that the theme of Scipio's dialogue with Alexander is continued in his meeting with Homer; it is therefore not surprising that his model is continued as well. Silius' Homer is attended by a large host of companions, who surround him *laeto clamore* ("with happy cries", 783). A similar phrase is used for the ghost of Heracles: ἀμφὶ δέ μιν κλαγγὴ νεκύων

---

him, just as the elder Scipio's death followed the treacherous defection of his Spanish troops (compare Agamemnon's denouncement of the female sex to Scipio's outcry at 13.678–679); lastly, both protagonists are moved to tears by the stories (*Od.* 11.465–466 ~ Sil. 13.696).

57 Juhnke (1972) 287, who compares Sil. 13.707–709 with *Od.* 11.473–476. Note that Agamemnon, who weeps at the end of his meeting with Odysseus (see n.56), is also a model here for Paulus' similar tears (13.716).

58 *Od.* 11.543–564 ~ Sil. 13.732–751.

59 *Od.* 11.538–540 ~ Sil. 13.750–751.

60 The parallelism between the two is indicated by Heracles himself at *Od.* 11.618–619. For a detailed analysis of the end of Homer's *Nekyia*, see Karanika (2011).

61 See also Fucecchi (1993) 39–40, who observes explicit parallels: both are *iuuenis*, *uictor*, of divine origin and a general without peer.

62 For his wanderings, cf. 13.763 *tellure uagus* (cf. e.g., Stat. *Silu.* 4.3.155: *uagus Hercules*); both Alexander and Hercules are parallels for the Roman emperors, for which see Fucecchi in this volume. Scipio's address of Alexander at 767–768 as *Libyci certissima proles Hammonis* interacts with Virgil's words on Hercules at *Aen.* 8.301 (*salue, uera Iouis proles*, "Hail, true seed of Jove"), which is echoed for Scipio himself at Sil. 4.476 (*uera Iouis proles*).

ἦν ("about him rose a clamor from the dead," *Od.* 11.605). Both Homer and Heracles receive an extensive description. But it is the first thing that is said of Heracles that should especially raise our interest. Odysseus says in the beginning of the scene:

> τὸν δὲ μετ᾽ εἰσενόησα βίην Ἡρακληείην,
> εἴδωλον· αὐτὸς δὲ μετ᾽ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι
> τέρπεται ἐν θαλίῃς καὶ ἔχει καλλίσφυρον Ἥβην. (Hom. *Od.* 11.601–603)
>
> And after him I became aware of the mighty Heracles—his phantom; for he himself among the immortal gods takes his joy in the feast, and has for wife Hebe of the beautiful ankles.

We have here a man who is dead but who is also deified; his shade (εἴδωλον; cf. *effigiem*) is in the Underworld, but he himself is with the gods. It has been observed that Hercules is a benefactor of mankind; so is Bacchus, whose description matches that of Homer. This brings us back to the beginning of this chapter: *meruit deus esse uideri*. Through his merits, Homer deserves his divine appearance; he has to be ranked among the great benefactors of mankind for his achievement of disclosing the nature of the world to his peers,[63] not to mention the achievement of inventing the poetry through which other such benefactors may be praised. With this semi-apotheosis Silius emulates the common Greek title for the great poet, θεῖος Ὅμηρος.[64]

Silius' scene ends with the last of the famous demigods who rose to divine status from mortal beginnings. After the Iliadic warriors, Scipio spots Castor, who is about to return to life again, or more precisely, to take his brother Pollux's place *in aethere*—in heaven.[65] This pair of brothers, who among the

[63] The same idea underlies Lucretius' encomium of Epicurus, who goes on, however, to compare his hero favorably to the traditional benefactor Hercules (5.22–42). Bassett (1966) 260–261 attributes the different treatments of Hercules to the opposite viewpoints in the Stoic (in his view) *Punica* and Epicurean *De rerum natura*, quoting Occioni's argument ([1871] 79) that the debate of Virtus and Voluptas in book 15 represents one between the two principal schools at Rome.

[64] For a brief discussion of the divinity (veritable or otherwise) attributed to Homer from the Hellenistic period, see Zeitlin (2001) 197–200, 204–205. Compare also the divine honors which Silius wishes to pay to Ennius for his merits (*meritum … honorem*, 12.390; the phrase is used by Virgil of offerings to the gods, as Hardie [1993] 113 observes).

[65] *uicturam hinc cernit Ledaei Castoris umbram; / alternam lucem peragebat in aethere Pollux* ("Then he sees the ghost of Castor, Leda's son, soon to return to life; Pollux was spending his turn of life in heaven," 13.804–805). Deremetz (1995) 473 associates Castor's appearance with the concept of reincarnation, symbolical of Silius' own status of *alter Homerus*; while the idea is attractive, Silius (unlike Ennius) does not present himself as the vessel of Homer's spirit.

two of them are also both in the Underworld and in heaven, forms a fitting conclusion to a passage which has as its major theme the transcendence of mortality—both for epic heroes and their poets.

As we have seen, the encounter with the ghost of Homer involves much more than just due praise to the father of epic; the passage sheds light upon Silius' own poetics and self-representation and upon the relation between Greek epic and his own most Roman achievement.[66] Silius broadens the laudation for Homer into a general homage to the potency of poetry, which grants immortality not merely to its characters, but also to the poet himself. The Flavian poet presents himself as the Roman Homer, who picks up and continues Homeric epic with Roman themes, thereby incorporating the similar status of his Latin predecessors Ennius and Virgil. When we combine his claim to be the heir to the legacy of divine Homer with the assertion of the immortalizing power of song, we can see that Silius has set the bar for the *Punica*'s reception high, indeed.

---

66 For the self-representation of Silius' contemporary Statius, see Bessone in this volume, pp. 215–233.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF POWER: GREEK LITERARY TRADITION AND SILIUS' *ON KINGSHIP*[*]

Marco Fucecchi

1. *Silius' "Inclusive" Epic and Greek Literary Tradition*

The title of this chapter may sound strange: after all, among the Flavian epic poems, the *Punica* is ostensibly the most "Roman"—and, consequently, the least "Greek"—by virtue of its programmatic interest in national history and identity. However, such a sophisticated epos, which displays impressive intertextual depth and establishes an all-inclusive dialogue with the literary tradition, is also meant to deal with history in a broader sense, with almost "universal" (if not properly encyclopedic) ambitions. In Silius' case, we could probably identify the expected imperial attitude towards the appropriation of world history, i.e., the tendency to analyze the past in order to impose an interpretation of ancient deeds.[1] While celebrating the glorious victory over Carthage and Hannibal as a true moral *aition* of the Roman empire—and, in particular, of the ascent of the Flavian dynasty—the *Punica* actually highlights the influence that Roman civilization starts exerting from the late third century BCE on fields which are traditional prerogatives of the Greeks. Obviously, Rome cannot claim to have a chronological primacy. Nevertheless, as history teaches us, during her rise to power the *Vrbs* has been able to draw the best from her authoritative predecessors, as well as to produce relevant, original contributions: before even becoming the indisputable *caput mundi*, Rome manages to produce new models deserving to be soon recognized as canonical, especially in areas such as military and political leadership (not to mention literature).

[*] I wish to thank Antony Augoustakis for his careful reading of this chapter and the numerous improvements made upon it, as well as the conference participants for their penetrating suggestions.

[1] In this sense, Silius takes advantage of Ovid's idiosyncratic project of universal history *sub specie metamorphoseos*, on which see Wheeler (2002) 163–189. For Ovid's presence in the *Punica*, cf. Bruère (1958) and (1959); Wilson (2004).

With regard to its particular relationship with Greek literature, which represents the major focus of this article (although in slightly "negative" sense), the *Punica* draws upon almost the whole range of epic models, starting with Homer and including Hesiod, Apollonius,[2] and perhaps even the puzzling historical-encomiastic epos of the Hellenistic age. At the same time, the Flavian poetic remake of the Second Punic War also takes into account the Greek prose tradition and its early reception at Rome. Indeed, conspicuous traces of genres such as epideictic oratory, historiography, and philosophy from the classical to the imperial age emerge on the narrative surface of Silius' poem, integrating the text's ideological meaning and enriching its referential complexity.

The collaboration between Roman history and its wider cultural context is often dramatized in single episodes that reenact the political character of epic as the "great" and "collective" genre par excellence. At times, literary history itself becomes an integral part of the narrative and finds a place next to the main military and political events. It is precisely "during the Second Punic War" that the "Muse enters Latium with her winged pace" (*pinnato gradu*, Porcius Licinus fr. 1 Courtney) and, from its typical "secondary" perspective, Silius' poem also seems to reconstruct the development of Roman literary culture, thematizing its relationship with national life as well as its dynamic appropriation of the Greek canonical tradition.[3]

2. *A New Historical Epic: Tradition of Genre and Other Influences (Cicero's Mediation of Greek Political Thought)*

The *Punica* obviously follows the Latin tradition of the historical epic, which has its thematic, almost generative, roots in the Roman wars against Carthage. Silius, however, has to deal primarily with the consequences of the Virgilian shift to a different mode of epicizing history. The *Aeneid* challenges the ancient epics of Naevius and Ennius by choosing the prehistory of Rome as the vantage point from which to look ahead towards the glory of the Augustan principate. Afterwards, Lucan and Silius, as Virgil's successors and imperial heirs of the historical epic, pinpoint a "place" within republican

[2] But Apollonius cannot probably be considered the only source used by Silius for the Argonautic saga: cf. Schubert (1998) 272–273.

[3] An exemplary artistic consequence of Silius' interest for immanent literary history is the representation of Ennius as "a poet at war" in *Pun.* 12.390–414; see Casali (2006).

history, from which to look at both the future and the past: an emblematic event regarded as an exemplary "myth" (be it a negative or positive), which is granted more of a universal than particular meaning in the Aristotelian sense. By tackling the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, Lucan creates an epic of cosmic destruction. On the contrary, the "untimely" choice of the Second Punic War, as the actual moment sanctioning Rome's assumption of a leading role in the Mediterranean world, allows Silius to reply with a "constructive" epic for a growing society which nevertheless faces many problems.

This subject matter also leads the poet to deal with ancient (i.e., Greek) theories about the birth and growth of Rome, its rapid military expansion, and its socio-political transformation. After having shaped the earlier stages of national epic poetry, this stock of ideas penetrates even more deeply into Roman culture with the definitive conquest of the East Mediterranean, and it is completely "metabolized" later, thanks also to the mediation of Cicero, one of the most important influences on Silius' work.[4] In his dialogues, where many protagonists of the intellectual and political life of the late republic feature as characters, Cicero sketches a number of "ideologized" reconstructions of the past which also illustrate the early integration of Greek political, as well as literary, culture into Roman society: a process of cross-fertilization where the native tradition of the *mos maiorum* contributes to a new constellation of intellectual and moral virtues.

Furthermore, Cicero's political oeuvre also represents for Silius a fundamental source as well as a model of reception with regard to a debate, which begins in Plato's *Republic*, on forms of primacy and leadership, with particular reference to the issue of the "good king," his moral virtues and / or his philosophical inclinations. Such a topic fits the interest of the Flavian poet who enhances the portrait of the ancient young leader of a rejuvenated Rome (Scipio Africanus) with numerous charismatic traits taken from the poetic as well as the rhetorical prose tradition.[5] The exemplary product of Silius' effort is that Scipio competes not only with Ciceronian characters, as for instance the two Scipios of the *De re publica*, but also with Alexander the Great, an exemplary figure of the Greek literary tradition on kingship.

---

4 Ripoll (2000).

5 In general, on Silius' treatment of Scipio Africanus, see Fucecchi (1993) and Marks (2005).

3. *The* Punica *as Ideologized Reconstruction of the Past: The Roots of a New Idea of Kingship*

The account of the victory over Hannibal allows Silius to recall the beginnings of Roman grandeur: upon defeating the troops of Pyrrhus of Epirus, the future world city definitively becomes a favorite theme of discussion and theorization for Greek historians, philosophers, orators, and poets. The Flavian poem effectively revitalizes ancient categories of political thought, like those elaborated between the second and first centuries BCE by Polybius, Panaetius, or Posidonius. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily mean that Silius limits himself to consider the Roman republican times with nostalgia, in order to stigmatize the contemporary crisis. Sharing the typical "inclusive" attitude of Flavian culture, that is, a self-conscious ambition of primacy, from the outset the author of the *Punica* seeks to establish constructive ideological connections with the imperial present. Although the historical account does not fail to confirm the loyalty of the ancient Roman leaders to republican ideals, as well as their embarrassment of dealing with the notion of extra-institutional power, we could say that, more or less directly, kingship is all but absent from Silius' agenda.

A crucial passage in Jupiter's prophecy in the third book provides the first example of the mythical relationship between the historical past and contemporary politics.[6] Immediately after the anonymous reference to the young leader who will defeat Hannibal in Africa (Sil. 3.590–592), the king of the gods announces and celebrates the future rise of the Flavian dynasty (3.594–629). In the last part of this eulogy, the emperor Domitian is directly addressed by the god himself as the *puer* who will surpass the glory of his family (*at tu transcendes, Germanice, facta tuorum*, 3.607). In the following book, during the battle of Ticinus, it is still Jupiter who emphatically introduces the first enterprise of the *puer* Scipio with a similar formula (... *tenerae qui proelia dextrae / iam credit puer atque annos transcendere factis / molitur*, "who already relies on his youthful arm for battle and aims at prowess beyond his years," 4.425–427).

Throughout the poem, other standard epic components, such as the *Nekyia* of book 13, enhance the charismatic nature of the great republican hero, Scipio. Later, however, an additional way of connecting past and present is dramatized, where the usage of myth is enriched by strong ideological (even "philosophical") meaning: at the beginning of book 15, soon

[6] On the whole prophecy, see now Fucecchi (2012).

after receiving the terrible news of his father's and uncle's death in Spain, the young Scipio makes the decisive choice for Virtus against Voluptas, in a scene of high symbolic value, and henceforth engages in a military and political career. In fact, this allegorical episode works as a complementary device: by highlighting a human set of ethical and political values, it could also implicitly fill the gap of a foundational myth for the Flavian dynasty, which does not share the divine background of the Julio-Claudians and rather tends to substantiate its self-representation with traditional (and national) cultural traits, such as its Sabine origins, its efforts to restore ancient morality, as well as its pragmatism, efficiency, and good administrative skills. Therefore, the exemplary scene created by Silius, with the decisive help of Greek cultural imagery, may be regarded as the aetiology of a virtuous collaboration between epic and philosophy (in the restricted sense of ethico-pragmatic wisdom) as synthesized in the heroic, semi-divine figure of the young Scipio.

4. *Alexander the Great as a Controversial Model of Kingship in Imperial Literature* (*and His Roman Counterpart*)

Thus, the *Punica* also showcases the topicality of the past by matching implicitly an ancient republican leader with an emperor, or more precisely by choosing the former—who, thanks to the epic mode, is given the status of a semi-divine hero like Hercules, Bacchus and other sons of Jupiter—to provide the ideal background to the latter.

This feature sets Silius into indirect competition with the Greek orators and philosophers, like Plutarch and Dio Chrysostom, who almost in the same period work to highlight the role played by their native cultural tradition within the empire as a factor of homogeneity and cohesion.[7] Indeed, when looking for the very archetype of world kingship, both Plutarch and Dio refer to an ancient (and obvious) model, Alexander the Great: a true king and a charismatic leader, the creator of the first world empire, the historical and canonized successor of Hercules and Dionysus.

We are not sure whether Alexander's presence in Rome effectively predates the age of Scipio Africanus, who, according to ancient sources, is most likely the first great republican *dux* to draw consciously upon the myth of

---

7 E.g. Dio Chrys. *On Kingship* 2; Plut. *Mor.* 328C–329D. On Plutarch's and Dio's activity as exemplary Greek intellectuals under the Roman Empire, see Desideri (2005a), (2005b), and (2007).

the Macedonian king in order to create his own legend.[8] Throughout the first century BCE, Alexander's image is linked to Julius Caesar, Pompey, Antony and finally Octavian Augustus, who is careful to temper its influence through the ideology of the *princeps ciuilis* and the propagandistic force of the *mos maiorum*. A century later, Greek literature still pays homage to Alexander as the absolute archetype of "imperial authority": he becomes the example of a cultural hero, the admirable synthesis of bravery and moral as well as intellectual virtues, who spreads Greek civilization throughout the world, thus enacting the Aristotelian type of the king-"philosopher" (and friend of philosophers) in contrast to Plato's ideal of the philosopher-king.

In fact, in early imperial Rome, where there is nothing comparable to the flourishing Greek revival of the genre περὶ βασιλείας, except for the idiosyncratic *De clementia* of Seneca, Alexander still remains an unavoidable term of reference for emperors. And yet this model of kingship, which inspires the way Caligula and Nero represent themselves as absolute monarchs,[9] is bitterly criticized, under Nero's reign in particular, by representatives of the Stoic, aristocratic opposition. Seneca himself and Lucan repeatedly blame Alexander for his uncontrolled ambition and intemperance of character, which provides the vital clue to tyrannical despotism.[10] Finally, Curtius Rufus' monograph, whose elusive character certainly does not help us solve the difficult problem of chronology, sufficiently demonstrates the controversial nature of such an archetype of autocracy.

During the "Flavian restoration," the aristocratic Silius shows a different attitude towards the nature of imperial power and calls on Alexander to play a positive, though complementary, role in constructing a Roman ideal of kingship.[11] The *Punica* looks for honorable compromises between its undeniably Stoic coloring and the interpretation of monarchy as the natural development of the charismatic power of those republican leaders, who despite a more or less explicit "autocratic vocation" are still careful to harmonize their behavior with ancient morality and the traditional set of institutional values.

---

8 Livy's counterfactual hypothesis about the outcome of Alexander's eventual attempt to conquer the West, with the consequent, inevitable clash with a still young Rome (Liv. 9.17–19) does not necessarily betoken an early propagandistic employment of the figure of the Macedonian king. On Alexander's presence in Roman political and cultural imagery, see Spencer (2002).

9 In the wake of Germanicus' overt *imitatio Alexandri*, see Spencer (2002) 191–193.

10 Sen. *Ben.* 1.13, 2.16, 7.2.5–6; *Ep.* 91.17, 94.62–63; Luc. 10.20–52.

11 Borszàk (1982); Rocca-Serra (1990); Marks (2005) 141–147.

In fact, the striking moral opposition the poem enacts between Alexander's two ideal heirs, Hannibal, on the one hand, and Scipio Africanus (*melior pietate fideque*, "superior in sense of duty and honor," 9.437) on the other, brings about a strong polarization between the negative aspects of (Alexandrian, as well as Roman) leadership[12] and its positive counterpart: after being celebrated by Seneca for his renunciation of absolute power no less than for his moral qualities (Sen. *Ep*. 86), Scipio is chosen by Silius as the archetype of a virtuous ruler, a "would-be king" and "unwitting philosopher" at the same time.

5. *The* Punica *and Homer as the Author of Poetry for Kings*

It is difficult to guess what kind of place the *Punica* occupies within the contemporary political debate or to outline its relationship with the Greek tradition on kingship without a preliminary look at the noble epic ancestors of Silius, namely Virgil, Ennius, and finally Homer.

Silius' poem presupposes a complex program of Homeric imitation, where the genre-models, *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, sometimes reach the unexpected status of exemplary models according to a shared practice in Flavian epic.[13] Silius does not restrict himself to revitalize famous set pieces like the *Nekyia* and the numerous Iliadic battle narratives, already exploited in the *Aeneid*. He also borrows from Homer single episodes, which are omitted by Virgil, and, displaying a good deal of imagination, adapts them into his own historical narration: for instance, consider the μάχη παραποτάμιος between the elder Scipio and the river Trebia (Sil. 4.638–699).

Most importantly, however, the Homeric poems provide ancient and illustrious examples of poetry for kings. The early acknowledgment of their strong ethico-political value had already led a "passionate fan" like Alexander the Great to give the myth of Homer universal diffusion: the archetypal poet had become the embodiment of Greek national identity and his poems the fundamental guide for every aspiring king. This extra-literary function is maintained unaltered even after the Roman conquest of Greece, as demonstrated, for instance, by the treatise *On the Good King According to Homer* by

---

12 As Lucan's poem widely demonstrates, Hannibal the Carthaginian, the archenemy of Rome, becomes the privileged point of intertext for the characters of Caesar and Pompey, the protagonists of the civil wars, who are also very fond of the *imitatio Alexandri*.

13 The survey of the Homeric parallels provided by Juhnke (1972) is still a fundamental starting point.

Philodemus of Gadara in the first century BCE, which probably relies upon Epicurus' περὶ βασιλείας. By the end of the first century CE, under the emperors, Alexander's support of Homer is repeatedly echoed in the four speeches περὶ βασιλείας by Dio Chrysostom[14] and in the two *opuscula* of Plutarch, *De fortuna aut uirtute Alexandri*.[15]

And in Silius' poem, the sudden appearance reserved to the shade of Homer himself during the *katabasis* of Scipio in *Punica* 13 denotes a similar interest in exploiting the political and didactic function of such a prestigious heritage. In this scene, drawing upon the symbolism of a divine investiture,[16] Homer is the exemplary figure of the poet who grants eternity to his characters. At the same time, Silius represents the protreptic function that epic poetry exerts over an ancient Roman leader, who is regarded as the ideal heir of a heroic lineage: a leader who, in turn, is to become the ancestor of a new generation of heroes. On his part, as the last scion of a poetic genealogy begun with the poet of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*,[17] Silius himself claims the same function for his own epic.

6. *Silius' Nekyia: Homer and the "Alexandrian" Frame*

It is time to look more closely at the image of Homer which Silius rapidly outlines in the *Nekyia*. In the Underworld, before Scipio's eyes, the shade of the poet is receiving grateful homage by kings and heroes who owe their glory entirely to him (Sil. 13.778–791).[18] The scene recalls the proem of Ennius' *Annales*, where the *simulacrum Homeri* appears for the first time in Latin literature (Enn. *Ann.* 3 Skutsch), as well as the epiphany of Anchises, surrounded by the great Romans of the future (Virg. *Aen.* 6.679–683). Homer's youth (*iuuenis*, Sil. 13.779) is probably another Ennian feature (Lucr. 1.124), which is reminiscent of Apollo's and Orpheus' iconography[19] and works

14 E.g. Dio Chrys. *On Kingship* 2.6: "The poetry of Homer, however, I look upon as alone truly noble and lofty and suited to a king, worthy of the attention of a real man, particularly if he expects to rule over all the peoples of the earth …"

15 E.g., Plut. *Mor.* 327F; see n. 41. It is tempting to imagine similar considerations about Homer's function also in the περὶ βασιλείας addressed to Alexander by his contemporaries Aristotle and Theopompus respectively.

16 Starting from Hesiod's *Dichterweihe* to Ennius' encounter with Homer's shade in the Underworld and finally to Virgil's *katabasis* of Aeneas.

17 In general on kinship as a narrative pattern of Flavian epic, see Bernstein (2008).

18 On Homer, see Manuwald (2007) and Van der Keur in the volume, pp. 287–304.

19 Cf. also how the *Aeneid*'s narrator introduces the shades of the ancient poets in his Underworld (*Aen.* 6.662–668).

as an evident intertextual signpost, endowed with outstanding metapoetic value: after Ennius, Lucretius, and Virgil, a "new Homer," i.e., a new phase in the Roman reception of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, is about to come. I will not insist too much on a topic which has already received considerable attention:[20] I would only observe that this particular episode implicitly reveals Silius' awareness of being the last successor to Homer in writing poetry for kings and at the same time shows his pride in granting and receiving that glory.

Homer resembles a god in Scipio's eyes (13.784–785 and 789), if not for his venerable majesty, mostly because of his power to ensure eternal fame through poetry. The future leader of the Roman army enviously watches Achilles and the other heroes whose deeds the divine poet had once celebrated. When the Sibyl stops, Scipio takes over and regrets that Rome and the Romans cannot have (or rather, *still* cannot have) the same chance. And in an exemplary *imitatio Alexandri*, Silius' Scipio quotes almost the exact words that according to Cicero the Macedonian general pronounces at Troy, as he stands in front of Achilles' tomb: *felix Aeacide, cui tali contigit ore / gentibus ostendi, creuit tua carmine uirtus* ("Blessed Achilles, whom it was granted to be shown to the world by such a voice! Your virtue has grown through his song," Sil. 13.796–797) ~ *o fortunate … adulescens, qui tuae uirtutis Homerum praeconem inueneris!* ("fortunate young man, to have gotten Homer as the herald of your *uirtus*!" Cic. *Arch.* 24).[21]

Moreover, Scipio's *makarismos* of the Homeric heroes sounds as a first indirect announcement of the "forthcoming" republican encomiastic poetry in the Homeric manner, which is about to start with Ennius himself: the author of the *Annales* and the *Scipio*, who appears as a poet at war in *Punica* 12. At the same time, when celebrating the future Africanus as a worthy descendant of Achilles & co. and remote precursor of Roman emperors, Silius implicitly points out his own future position as Ennius' successor. Moreover, contrary to Alexander (annoyed with his company of advisors, historians, and bad poets), the young Scipio will profit from having two good poets (not just one, as Achilles and the other Greek epic heroes): in two different phases of Roman history, Ennius and Silius Italicus will celebrate Scipio's heroic deeds, his virtues and charismatic model of leadership.

---

[20] E.g., Zeitlin (2001) and now Van der Keur in this volume, pp. 287–304.

[21] This is also a response to Lucan, who comments on the poet's role as "glory-maker" in his own Trojan episode, when Caesar pays homage to Achilles' tomb and craves eternal glory (Luc. 9.980–986); see Van der Keur in this volume, pp. 292–293.

This sequence represents the closure of the Alexander narrative frame: the first part of this frame is centered around the appearance of the shade of Alexander himself at the end of the gallery of heroes (Sil. 13.762–775), which actually introduces that of Homer. As it has been observed, the scene provides a further link to Anchises' presentation of Augustus in Virgil.[22] But contrary to Aeneas, who knows the name of the future restorer of the Golden Age thanks to Anchises (*Augustus Caesar*, *Aen.* 6.792), Scipio does not receive such an explicit indication by the Sibyl. He is rather left with the task of guessing the identity of the great leader who stands before him: this is relatively easy, because Scipio obviously cannot think of other future Roman heirs of Alexander on his own.[23] In response to Scipio's question, which manifests ardent yearning for glory, Alexander's exhortation to seek military enterprises, rapidly and at any cost, sounds like an official investiture. The Macedonian king encourages the young leader to avoid the impending menace of death by performing heroic *uirtus* without the least hesitation.[24] This advice partially corrects Alexander's bad reputation of barbaric cruelty, which is mainly fuelled by the Roman Stoics throughout the first century CE and which finds literary voice in Seneca and Lucan.

Moreover, the dialogue with Alexander has an important antecedent in Scipio's encounter with his own mother Pomponia (Sil. 13.615–649), which marks a preliminary step towards the officialization of the Alexander model as a structuring pattern for Scipio's image.[25] In that circumstance, the future Roman leader learns of his divine origin for the first time, while the reader is invited to appreciate the building of a new myth operated by encomiastic poetry. Pomponia tells Scipio how Jupiter had raped her one night in the guise of a serpent (13.634–647), in the same miraculous manner of

---

22 *hic uir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis* ("this is the man whom you often hear promised to you," Virg. *Aen.* 6.791) ~ *hic ille est, tellure uagus qui uictor in omni / cursu signa tulit* ("this is the man, who ranged in arms over every land," Sil. 13.763), with the following series of exotic geographical names: *Garamantas et Indos* (*Aen.* 6.794), *Caspia regna*, *Maeotia tellus* and *ostia Nili* (*Aen.* 6.798–800) ~ *Bactra, Dahae, Ganges, Niphates, Nilus* (Sil. 13.764–766). In Silius' Underworld, however, neither Aeneas nor Virgil find a place as characters.

23 This also agrees with other choices, such as Jupiter's reticence concerning Augustus and the Julio-Claudian dynasty in the prophecy to Venus in the third book. According to a typical encomiastic "reflex" (cf. Sen. *Clem.* 1.9.1–11.3), Silius apparently aims at highlighting the superiority of the Flavian dynasty and its rulers over the Augustan model (e.g., Sil. 3.594–595; cf. also Stat. *Silu.* 4.1.31–33); see Fucecchi (2012) 247 and n. 37 with further bibliography.

24 This portrait resembles the figure of the impulsive young Alexander depicted by Dio at the beginning of his first speech *On Kingship*.

25 See the relevant analysis by Augoustakis (2010a) 213–221; the scene could be considered a prologue to the Alexander narrative in the *Nekyia* (see above).

conception claimed by the Alexander propaganda.[26] The visit of the Underworld essentially provides the context where the relationship between Scipio and Alexander is made explicit with the revelation of the double paternity (human and divine). Livy and other historians often remark on the charismatic nature of the young Scipio and mention the legend, astutely fuelled by Scipio himself, about mysterious encounters and secret conversations between him and his Olympian father in the Capitoline temple.[27] The Flavian epicist capitalizes on this tradition but also seems careful to eliminate suspicions and doubts concerning Scipio's good faith. The *Punica* reconstructs, and sometimes even completes, the "edifice" of Scipio's mythology: the aim is to stress the superiority of his positive Roman model of leadership over the one embodied by Hannibal, his tyrannical antagonist.

7. *Scipio's* imitatio Alexandri *before the "Double Investiture"*

The emergence of the future leader begins when he is still a "child," if not in the proper sense. At the Ticinus, under the proud gaze of Jupiter and Mars, the *puer* Scipio[28] accomplishes his first military deed, killing many an enemy and saving the life of his (mortal) father who is gravely wounded (Sil. 4.459–471).

About twenty years ago, I tried to explore the cultural and literary matrices of the eagle portent which precedes Scipio's enterprise (4.115–119), by underscoring its meaning as a symbolic announcement of future kingship (4.459–460).[29] Here I would like to add that while recalling Aeneas' flight from Troy with Anchises on his shoulders, this *exemplum* of precocious bravery is most probably the first Alexander feature in Scipio Africanus' biography, chronologically speaking. According to Curtius Rufus (Curt. 8.1.24), Alexander rescues his father's life, who had been wounded during a mercenary revolt: the young hero covers Philip with his shield and kills the enemies, as they try to get closer.[30] But there is another interesting detail: Silius' poem is apparently the only source where the *puer* attempts to commit

26 E.g., Curt. 4.7.8; Plut. *Alex*. 2.2.

27 Cf. Liv. 26.19.3–9; see Gabba (1975).

28 According to Polybius (10.3), Scipio was 17 years old; cf. also Liv. 21.46.7; Val. Max. 5.4.2; Sen. *Ben*. 3.33.1; Plin. *Nat*. 16.5; App. *Hann*. 5.18; Dio Cass. fr. 56.43; Zonar. 8.23.

29 Fucecchi (1993) and now Marks (2005).

30 Alexander himself would have been the source of the anecdote. According to other sources, the episode takes place one or two years earlier, during a battle against the Triballi.

suicide before entering the fight because of the pain over his father's destiny (4.454–459). In fact, this potentially tragic gesture, thwarted only by the intervention of Mars, is not to be the last of Scipio's uncontrolled reactions. In book 13, before the descent into the Underworld, the future leader of the Roman army is given the news of his father's and uncle's death in Spain: at first, he reacts with a violent attack of self-punishing rage, which soon is unleashed as a fury against the gods (13.388–392). One wonders whether such excessive reactions may be implicitly considered as a further hint of Alexander's well-known tendency for impulsive, violent outbursts.[31] It is only after the revelation of his divine origin in the *Nekyia* and the Crossroads episode in book 15 that Scipio definitively becomes a true, self-controlled Roman leader.

8. *Scipio at the Crossroads: A Tribute to Greek Cultural Heritage and Its Romanization*

The heroic tension and thirst for glory, recommended by Alexander's shade, will be crowned by other virtues, inherent in the political role that the young leader assumes together with the military command. Scipio will thoroughly display all qualities (moral discipline, religious *pietas*, and divine reason) after an emblematic scene: a remake of the anecdote of Hercules' choice, which we know from a number of Greek and Latin sources.[32] While the *Nekyia* is a stock epic episode, Scipio at the Crossroads, which opens the fifteenth book, is a hybrid from Greek rhetorical and philosophical prose. However, the pre-eminence of the latter does not eclipse the influence of the former: after all, revelations and symbolic investitures received by heroes in a dream are familiar to the epic tradition.[33]

To be sure, Scipio is not asleep when the personifications of Virtus and Voluptas appear before him (Sil. 15.18–31). Nevertheless, the situation may recall another foundational epic pattern, that the Judgment of Paris and

---

31 E.g., Dio Chrys. *On Kingship* 1.7.

32 The anecdote related by Xenohon (*Mem.* 2.1.21–34) is attributed to the sophist Prodicus; cf. also Cic. *Off.* 1.118. Silius' refashioning, however, seems more influenced by some passages of the *De re publica* (1.1 and 1.4–7, 3.1) and *De legibus* (1.24–27): see Heck (1970) and now Schultheiss (2012).

33 The young Raphael chose this very context for his famous *The Dream of the Knight* (ca. 1504; London, National Gallery), inspired by "the hero at the Crossroads" theme and possibly by Silius' episode itself.

its outcome. The mythic aetiology of the Trojan war, which also occupies a strategic place within Silius' poem (7.437–493), is frequently matched by the Crossroads type of scene from antiquity (particularly in ancient Greek vase painting) to Renaissance culture. In addition, the two episodes share the same opening function. Like Venus' victory in the beauty contest, which activates the plot of the Trojan war (and, consequently, the birth of Rome but also the destruction of Carthage), the dramatization of Scipio's choice of *Virtus* actually inaugurates a new phase in the epic narrative as well as in Silius' discourse on kingship.[34] According to the expected Flavian attitude towards a reconstruction of literary paths and backgrounds, the poet stages the very antecedent to the famous dream of Scipio Aemilianus, the *Somnium Scipionis*: the words of Virtus to the future Africanus provide the (belated) aetiology of the speech that, at the end of Cicero's *De re publica*, the ghost of the Africanus himself will address (i.e., had addressed, according to literary chronology) to his nephew-in-law, the conqueror of Carthage, as announced by Proteus himself at the end of his account of Paris' judgment in *Punica* 7 (*hic dabit ex sese qui tertia bella fatiget / et cinerem Libyae ferat in Capitolia uictor*, "and his son will finish a third war with victory and bring back the ashes of Libya to the Capitol," 7.492–493).

Moreover, the episode of Scipio at the Crossroads demonstrates that Silius' relationship with Cicero's political thought is no less pervasive than his debt to Virgil and the whole epic tradition, including Homer. The *Punica* accounts for the early imperial reception of Cicero's last production as the founding act of a new Roman theorization on leadership, if not on kingship directly. In addition to the allusion to the Greek anecdote in the *De officiis*, where Ἀρετή and Κακία are respectively named as Virtus and Voluptas for the first time (Cic. *Off*. 1.118), Silius invokes other passages from the *De legibus* and *De re publica* which show the retrospective familiarization of Roman culture with the issue of autocracy. For example, consider how Scipio Aemilianus, the protagonist of the *De re publica*, explicitly acknowledges monarchy as the second preferable option after the so-called "mixed form" of government: "If I were compelled to approve one single unmixed form, I might choose and particularly praise the kingship" (Cic. *Rep*. 1.54); "since this is true, the kingship in my opinion is by far the best of the three

[34] Virtus is the opposite of the goddess of love in cultural, as well as "aesthetic," terms. Rather, it is Voluptas who is fashioned in Venus' style. On the Judgment of Paris in Silius and its general ideological implications with other scenes, such as Scipio's encounter with Virtue and Pleasure, see Littlewood (2011) 182–190.

primary forms" (1.69); "but I cannot assent to your statement that aristocratic government is superior to kingship; for if wisdom rules the state, what difference does it make whether that wisdom is the possession of one person or of several?" (3.47). In these passages, as Matthew Fox has argued, Cicero is probably idealizing a nostalgic view of politics that does not contemplate the problem posed by dictators of the late first century BCE.[35] And yet, this does not necessarily represent an impasse for Silius. The Flavian poet does not need to be so explicit (monarchy is a given for him) and his specific interest is to legitimize further this form of government: for that purpose, he tries to imagine a "mythical" republican *incunabulum* for his own literary model, i.e., Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*.

Thus, while the young, Flavian Scipio becomes the ideal precursor of Cicero's Aemilianus as the future leader who needs to be "educated," the voice of Silius' Virtus resonates with exhortations almost recalling those pronounced by the Ciceronian ghost of Scipio Africanus: a) serve your own country and win your place in heaven (Sil. 15.77–78 and 113–120 ~ Cic. *Rep.* 6.13); and b) resist the lure of Voluptas (Sil. 15.92–97 ~ Cic. *Rep.* 6.29).[36] A further key concept which Silius shares with Cicero is the compatibility of *uirtus* with Alexander's thirst for glory. The perfect ruler knows the true value of glory and of other earthly goods: he does not consider personal ambition as evil per se (e.g., Cic. *Off.* 2.31–51), but he is always aware of vanity. While recommending self-restraint and praising freedom from *fortuna*, Silius' Virtus is nonetheless pleased to have suitors like *Honor, Laudes, Gloria, Decus*, *Victoria*, and *Triumphus* (Sil. 15.99–100).

9. *Crossroads and Judgments: Silius, Greek Imperial Tradition on Kingship, and the Improvement of the Alexander Model*

The remake of episodes (Crossroads or Judgments), with its peculiar mix of epic structures and philosophical heritage, is a feature that the Flavian poem shares with the Greek speeches περὶ βασιλείας of the late first and early second centuries CE. In particular, the "choice theme" characterizes, among other texts, Dio's first oration *On Kingship*, whose imagery and cast are quite familiar: the two peaks (instead of the two roads or the two women);[37]

35 Fox (2007) 91–98.

36 See Marks (2005) 158–159.

37 Dio Chrys. *On Kingship* 1.70–82. But, in Dio's oration, two women appear as the "owners" of the two peaks: *Basileia* and *Tyrannis*.

Homer, the guide of every would-be king; Hercules and Alexander as two figures of the ideal addressee (or narratee), i.e., the emperor.

Silius' introduction of a Roman historical protagonist is an important step towards the nationalization of the Greek pedagogical paradigm.[38] At the same time, Scipio's portrait also represents an improvement on the Alexander model. As we have already seen, in the *Nekyia* the Sibyl introduces the Macedonian king as an ardent warrior, eager for glory and obsessively prosecuted by deathly premonitions: he does not look like the tyrant or the *felix praedo*, who embodies the evil of absolute power in Seneca and Lucan. Nonetheless, even though his *uirtus* does not actually exceed the limits of a heroic striving for *laudes*, his portrait has almost nothing to share with the king-philosopher of Plutarch and Dio:[39] in the *Punica*, moral and intellectual virtues remain exclusive prerogatives of Scipio, who somehow may recall the Alexander portrait elaborated by Greek imperial rhetoric.

Rather, some subtle connections between Alexander's "instructions" and the last words of Voluptas are perhaps worth mentioning. Despite their opposite perspectives (*adfectatio gloriae* vs. *otium*), the two speeches obsessively point to the ephemeral nature of human life and the inexorable flight of time. Moreover, Voluptas reminds Scipio of her universal might, her power to favor the birth of semi-divine heroes from the union between gods and human beings (Sil. 15.59–62): after all, Scipio himself is one of them, just like Alexander. Scipio, however, does not share Paris' tastes, and Voluptas cannot persuade him, not even evoke his gratitude. Other inborn qualities of divine nature guide the young Roman: the *caelestia semina mentis* celebrated by Virtus (15.71–72). By exploiting them, he will become the very successor of Hercules, Bacchus, and Quirinus, and, we might add, the ideal precursor of a virtuous dynasty of rulers. From the ancient past, Scipio also teaches the Romans of the late first century CE, who have already lived through the times promised by Voluptas (15.125), how the Empire can be (and has actually been) saved and (re)founded by a new generation of leaders.

---

38 Whitmarsh (2001).

39 See Plutarch's first discourse, *De fortuna aut uirtute Alexandri*, and, in particular, Dio's second oration *On Kingship*.

10. *Practical Wisdom: Alexander, Scipio, and the Construction of the National Archetype of the "Unwitting Philosopher"*

According to Aristotle and the Peripatetic School, by far action is more important than theory for a ruler, while the king himself must not be a philosopher but he must rather count philosophers among his best friends and advisors.[40] This concept does not actually contrast with the ideal type of the king engaged in philosophy as it is theorized by Musonius or Plutarch himself, and many early imperial portraits of Alexander show that he relies upon a practical kind of wisdom.[41] The "armed philosopher"—as the Macedonian king was defined by one of his historians, Onesicritus (*FGrHist* 134 F17)—is still celebrated in early imperial literature for introducing Greek *paideia* among eastern nations. He follows Aristotle's teaching and, according to his own words, is fond of Homer but mainly speaks through action. Thanks to his anti-theoreticism, Alexander is quite comparable to great philosophers who are not used to writing essays like the sophists do.[42] However, contrary to Socrates and Pythagoras, Alexander also has to face other formidable issues, such as war and, above all, power.[43]

---

40 E.g., Arist. *On Kingship* 2 (R^3 647 = Them. *orat.* 107cd): "We should honor Aristotle, who altered slightly Plato's statement and made his advice truer. Aristotle said that it was not merely unnecessary for a king to be a philosopher, but even distinct disadvantage. What a king should do was to listen to and take the advice of true philosophers. In doing so, he would enrich his reign with good deeds and not merely with fine words" (trans. Chroust [1968] 17).

41 E.g., Alexander speaking in Dio Chrys. *On Kingship* 2.26: "Nor again is it necessary that he [the king] study philosophy to the point of perfecting himself in it; he need only live simply and without affectation, to give proof by his very conduct of a character that is human, gentle, just, lofty and brave as well, and, above all, one that takes delight in bestowing benefits—a trait which approaches most nearly to the nature divine." See also Plut. *Mor.* 327E–F: "For who has ever put forth with greater or fairer equipment than he: greatness of soul, keen intelligence, self-restraint, and manly courage, with which Philosophy herself provided him for his campaign? Yes, the equipment that he had from Aristotle his teacher when he crossed over into Asia was more than what he had from his father Philip. But although we believe those who record that Alexander once said that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* accompanied him as equipment for his campaigns, since we hold Homer in reverence …" Cf. Muson. 8.32, 39–40: "For my part, I believe that the good king is straightway and of necessity a philosopher, and the philosopher a kingly person … he should be courageous, fearless, resolute in the face of things apparently disastrous, and besides beneficent, helpful, and humane" (trans. https://sites.google.com/site/thestoiclife/the_teachers/musonius-rufus/lectures/08, accessed 09/25/2013).

42 Plut. *Mor.* 330F: "If you subtract from Alexander's sayings his crown, his relationship with Ammon and his noble birth, they will appear to you as utterances of a Socrates or a Plato or a Pythagoras."

43 Plut. *Mor.* 328A–B: "And yet even Pythagoras wrote nothing at all, nor did Socrates,

In Rome, the idea of superiority of praxis over theory becomes prevalent thanks to Panaetius and Posidonius.[44] Probably taking his cue from the historico-anthropological theories of a Peripatetic scholar in the fourth century BCE, Dicaearchus of Messana (whose interest in reconstructing the birth and the evolution of the most ancient human civilizations should have influenced Varro's antiquarian work as well),[45] Cicero considers the greatest men of the Roman past to be even better than their (more cultivated) Greek counterparts: their inborn virtue, skill, moral discipline, and the practice of good deeds lead them to "philosophy," thus perfectly complementing their lack of philosophical and literary education.[46] According to Cicero, Scipio Africanus is the national archetype of a leader as "unwitting philosopher," who entirely owes his wisdom to nature and who exploits his innate qualities in the field of praxis: "Many there have been, no doubt, exceptionally endowed in temperament and character, who, without any aid from culture, but only by a heaven-born light within their souls, have been self-schooled in restraint and fortitude … Such a character our fathers were privileged to behold in the divine figure of Scipio Africanus …" (Cic. *Arch.* 15–16).[47] This republican pre-philosophical type of the virtuous and wise ruler, which predates the massive penetration of Greek culture in the second century BCE, cannot be properly considered as a product of educational training.

Silius' rediscovery of such a paradigm may look like a typical chauvinist pose. And yet what matters to him is re-enacting a national archetype which could be successfully matched with the Alexander model. With his admirable synthesis of *magnitudo animi* and self-restraint, further illustrated by the charisma granted by divine blessing, the Flavian Scipio perfectly fits the type. His victory over Hannibal sanctions the birth of a new

---

nor Arcesilaus, nor Carneades, who were all most notable among philosophers. Nor were these philosophers continuously occupied with such tremendous wars, nor with spreading civilization among foreign princes, nor in establishing Grecian cities among savage nations, nor did they go on and on, instructing lawless and ignorant tribes in the principles of law and peace; but, even though they had leisure, they relinquished the writing of philosophy to sophists."

44 E.g., Posidonius: *FGrH* 87 F112.

45 On Dicaearchus, see Fortenbaugh-Schütrumpf (2001) and the up-to-date assessment by McConnell (2012) at: http://www.academia.edu/879012/Cicero_and_Dicaearchus. For Dicaearchus' influence over Cicero, see also Narducci (1992) 54–55.

46 E.g., Cic. *Tusc.* 1.1: "… it has always been my conviction that our countrymen have shown more wisdom everywhere than the Greeks, either in making discoveries for themselves, or else in improving upon what they had received from Greece—in such subjects at least as they had judged worthy of the devotion of their efforts."

47 Cf. also Cic. *Amic.* 18, *Fin.* 3.11, *Off.* 3.16, *Rep.* 3.7.

leadership, and, from the modern perspective of an imperial poet, it may represent the foundational act of a new idea of kingship. After the divine investiture and his choice of Virtus, the young Roman general manages to rouse enthusiasm among soldiers and the Roman people as well as the admiration of Spaniards and Africans, who have the chance to witness a display of his virtues and innate qualities. In so doing, he indirectly sketches the pattern of a great leader who deserves the affection and love of his citizens, a pattern which will maintain its validity in the future.

Silius' Scipio embodies an exemplary compromise between the national tradition of the *mos maiorum* and new political and cultural trends. Such a virtuous balance reaches its climax when the Roman general rejects the title of king, which the Spanish people want to bestow upon him (Sil. 16.277–284): he is the model of republican restraint.[48] Indeed, when Scipio implicitly reaffirms that every Roman military chief owes his authority to no one but the senate and people of Rome, he shows his respect for a fundamental tenet of the Roman tradition: once transposed into contemporary history, such a message could assume special semantic relevance, especially if we think of the revolts and military pronouncements preceding the rise of the Flavian dynasty.

Scipio later displays the characteristics of Alexander, when he is called to defend his project of invading Africa, given the aristocratic opposition. In his answer to Fabius' attack during the Senate session, Scipio reminds the senators, with a vein of polemical irony, that he had dared to take the place of his father and uncle, amidst the general lack of confidence, thus carrying the weight of the war all alone (16.649–651); he also makes new, implicit allusions to his own special relationship with the gods (… *nunc ultimus actis / restat Carthago nostris labor. hoc sator aeui / Iuppiter aeterni monet*, "Now Carthage alone remains, and the conquest of Carthage will crown my career; I know this from Jupiter, the Father of eternal life," 16.663–665). Hence at the end of the debate Scipio manages to obtain the enthusiastic favor of the Senate thanks to his oratorical skills and the force of destiny (16.698–699). The narrator here is more careful than Livy not to exasperate the tension between Scipio and the other members of the *élite*. Despite his political success, the young leader never loses control nor shows any lack of respect for the republican institutions.

48 Tipping (2010a).

11. *Conclusion: The Conquest of the West, i.e., When Scipio Makes Alexander's Dream Come True*

Scipio Africanus is chosen by Silius as the ancient precursor of the *ciuilis* kingship. He embodies a less embarrassing model than Julius Caesar, the other image of Alexander's heritage, whose life Plutarch chooses to match with that of the Macedonian king. As such, Scipio could also play, in a broader sense, the role of a "national archetype" of *uirtus* for a dynasty which, contrary to the *Iulii*, cannot boast mythical ancestry.

At the beginning of the *Nekyia*, when he still does not know about his divine origins, Scipio displays absolute devotion towards his motherland and declares himself ready to reject any personal ambitions for the common good (13.517–518). Nothing has apparently changed after the revelation: at the beginning of book 15, just like a new Hercules, he is preparing to become a true leader, undergoing heroic labors for the commonwealth.

It is difficult, however, to underestimate the imperial(istic) flavor of Scipio's final triumph, when the victory over Carthage is assimilated to a general conquest of the Western world (17.629–654): the young Roman leader seems to have actually fulfilled Alexander's ancient dream.[49] The Greek historical model is finally surpassed even in the field of military deeds: it is Scipio who brings the light to "peoples who never saw the sun," as Plutarch says when referring to the premature death of the Macedonian king (*Mor.* 330D). By defeating Hannibal, the most dangerous contender for the title of the greatest world leader after Alexander's death, Scipio also overcomes the negative side of the latter's heritage.

According to a famous anecdote narrated by Livy (35.14.5–12), one day in Ephesus Hannibal himself indirectly granted Scipio Africanus the honor of absolute primacy among military leaders, when declaring that, if it had not been for Scipio—the only who managed to defeat him—he would have been considered the greatest general ever, even better than Alexander.[50]

---

[49] An effect enacted, in particular, by the triumphal parade of ethnic and geographical names from the conquered lands: Africa and Spain (17.629–642).

[50] Livy's source is Claudius Quadrigarius: when Africanus asked who in Hannibal's opinion was the greatest general, Hannibal named Alexander, because with a small force he had routed innumerable armies and because he had traversed the most distant regions. In the second place, Hannibal ranked Pyrrhus, saying that he had been the first to teach the art of laying out a camp; he possessed also the art of winning men over to him, so that the Italian peoples preferred the lordship of a foreign king to that of the Roman people. When he continued, asking whom Hannibal considered third, he named himself without hesitation. Then Scipio broke into a laugh and said, "What would you say if you had defeated me?" "Then,

In fact, Scipio was awarded an extraordinary prize *hors concours* by his rival. About one and a half century later, following the account of a Greek writer, Lucian, a similar scene comes to a slightly different end: Alexander maintains the primacy, while Scipio's second place (ahead of Hannibal) tastes like a victory (*Dial. Mort.* 25).

beyond doubt," he replied, "I should place myself both before Alexander and before Pyrrhus and before all other generals." For a similar typology, see already Cic. *Luc.* 2.3 where the competition is about Lucullus and Mithridates; cf. Spencer (2002) 168–169.

PART V

MARTIAL

'GRAECE NUMQUID' AIT 'POETA NESCIS?' MARTIAL AND THE GREEK EPIGRAMMATIC TRADITION

Margot Neger

In book 9 of Martial's *Epigrams*, we encounter the poet admiring a statuette of the *Hercules Epitrapezios* owned by Novius Vindex[1] and wondering who might have created the impressive art object:

> Alciden modo Vindicis[2] rogabam
> esset cuius opus laborque felix.
> risit, nam solet hoc, leuique nutu
> 'Graece numquid' ait 'poeta nescis?
> inscripta est basis indicatque nomen.'
> Λυσίππου lego, Phidiae putaui. (Mart. 9.44)

> I recently asked the Alcides of Vindex whose work and happy labor he was. He laughed, for that is his way, and with a slight nod, "Poet," he said, "don't you know Greek? The base is inscribed and shows the name." I read Lysippus. I thought it was Phidias'.

Martial here self-deprecatingly presents his poetic *persona* as a beholder of a piece of art who is not able to identify the artist from the character of the statuette. Thus he stands in stark contrast to his friend Novius Vindex, who in a contemporary poem by Statius is praised as an excellent art connoisseur:

> mille ibi tunc species aerisque eborisque uetusti
> atque locuturas mentito corpore ceras
> edidici. quis namque oculis certauerit usquam
> Vindicis, artificum ueteres agnoscere ductus
> et non inscriptis auctorem reddere signis? (Stat. *Silu.* 4.6.20–24)

> There it was and then that I learned of a thousand shapes of bronze and antique ivory and of false bodies in wax, ready to speak. For who would ever rival Vindex' eyes in recognizing the hands of old masters and restoring its maker to an untitled statue?

---

[1] On this statuette, cf. Mart. 9.43, the companion-piece to 9.44; see Cancik-Lindemaier (1971); Coleman (1988) 176; Bonadeo (2010) 43–56; Henriksén (2012) 187–196; Neger (2012) 126–129. Martial's and Statius' poems on the *Hercules Epitrapezios* were probably published around 94 / 95 CE, cf. Nauta (2002) 441–444.

[2] On arguments supporting the reading *Alciden ... Vindicis*, transmitted in the β-group cf. Henriksén (2012) 197–199.

By contrast to Martial's 9.44, Novius Vindex is able to identify an object's artist without having to read any signature.[3] Our epigrammatist, however, needs the Greek inscription,[4] which the statuette itself points out to him; at the same time it mockingly asks him whether he is able to read Greek at all. This creates a funny effect, given that Martial in the immediately preceding epigram, which also deals with the *Hercules Epitrapezios Noui Vindicis*, has just demonstrated his close intimacy with Greek literature: after having listed the statuette's previous owners in 9.43.7–10 as Alexander the Great, Hannibal, and Sulla, Martial concludes the poem by comparing Novius Vindex to the mythological character of Molorcus: *utque fuit quondam placidi conuiua Molorchi, / sic uoluit docti Vindicis esse deus* ("… and, as once he was the dinner guest of peaceful Molorcus, so now the god has chosen to be lettered Vindex's," Mart. 9.43.13–14). In Callimachus' *Aetia*, Molorcus receives Hercules as a guest in his modest home.[5] Thus, in 9.43, Martial proves himself a *poeta doctus* familiar with the Hellenistic tradition of the Hercules-legend,[6] and in 9.44 the demigod himself mockingly accuses him for not even being able to decipher a simple Greek inscription—this, of course, would be all the more embarrassing for someone who calls himself an epigrammatist.

In the pair of poems just mentioned we can see a typical example of what one could call Martial's poetics of contradiction,[7] which is also a prominent feature of the epigrammatist's negotiation with the Greek tradition of his genre: often something which is either not mentioned at all or even explicitly denied by the poet himself or the poet's spokesperson (like Hercules in 9.44), will nevertheless indirectly appear in the corpus through an intertextual allusion. Such strategy is also pursued within Martial's reception of his Greek predecessors in the field of epigram: they are rarely mentioned explicitly (though Martial refers to many other poets in his books),[8] but the poet

---

[3] Several scholars have suggested that in 9.44 there might be a deliberate allusion to Statius' characterization of Novius Vindex in the *Siluae*: cf. Kershaw (1997); McNelis (2008) 268; Bonadeo (2010) 47–48; Henriksén (2012) 197–201.

[4] Canobbio (2011b) 76–85 convincingly argues for reading Greek Λυσίππου instead of the Latin *Lysippum*, preferred by Housman (1907) 246–247; Shackleton Bailey (1990) and (1993); and Henriksén (2012) 197–199.

[5] Callim. *Aet.* fr. 60c Harder; Apollod. 2.5.1; Serv. ad *G.* 3.19; [Prob.] ad Virg. *G.* 3.19; Mart. 4.64.30; Stat. *Silu.* 3.1.29, 4.6.51; cf. Fabbrini (2005).

[6] On the reception of Callimachus in Martial's epigrams and other Flavian poets, see Cowan in this volume, pp. 345–371.

[7] See Lorenz (2002) 14–21 and 223.

[8] Cf. Neger (2012); Mindt (forthcoming).

rather often alludes to them within the corpus. In what follows I would like to show how Martial makes use of Greek epigram in programmatic passages and exploits the Greek tradition for his own literary self-definition.

Epigrammatic poetry as a literary genre has no *primus inuentor* per se. This might be one of the reasons why, on the one hand, several Hellenistic epigrams are ascribed to archaic and classical lyric poets, such as Simonides, Archilochus, Bacchylides, Sappho, and Anacreon, and why later epigrammatists frequently allude to their texts. Obviously, Hellenistic writers and readers feel the need to establish retroactively an epigrammatic tradition by reading these earlier poets as generic predecessors with no regard to their own generic self-conception.[9]

I suggest that a similar process can be observed in Latin epigram of the Flavian era: Martial programmatically tags, among others, the Roman poet Catullus as his most important epigrammatic model, even though Catullus himself never characterizes his poems as *epigrammata*:[10]

> lasciuam uerborum ueritatem, id est epigrammaton linguam, excusarem, si meum esset exemplum: sic scribit Catullus, sic Marsus, sic Pedo, sic Gaetulicus, sic quicumque perlegitur. (Mart. 1 *praef*. 9–12)

> As for the license I use in calling a spade a spade, the language of epigram that is to say, I should make apology if the example were of my setting. But that is how Catullus writes, and Marsus, and Pedo, and Gaetulicus, and whoever else is read all through.

Already for ancient readers it seems to have been quite difficult to assign Catullus' poetry to a certain genre—Martial's contemporary Quintilian refers to him as writer of both epigrams (Quint. *Inst*. 1.5.20) and of iambic poetry (*Inst*. 10.1.96), while the Augustan elegists list Catullus among their predecessors in composing love poetry.[11] Hence, one might say that Martial constructs a Roman epigrammatic tradition and in this context consciously reduces Catullus' poetry to certain aspects that suit his literary program, including, in particular, the use of obscene language;[12] the Flavian epigrammatist thus utilizes the Neoteric writer for his own poetic purposes.

---

9 Sens (2007) 374–375; cf. Acosta-Hughes and Barbantani (2007); Sider (2007).

10 Cf. Swann (1994) 47–63; Puelma (1996) 135 with n. 44. Apart from the preface to the first book, Martial mentions Catullus in the following epigrams: 1.7.3–4, 61.1, 109.1; 2.71.3; 4.14.13–14; 5.5.6; 6.34.7; 7.14.3, 99.7; 8.73.8; 10.78.16, 103.5; 11.6.16; 12.44.5, 59.3, 83.4(?); 14.77, 100, 152, 195.

11 Prop. 2.25.3–4, 34.87–88; Ov. *Am*. 3.9.62, *Tr*. 2.427–430; Mart. 8.73; cf. Wiseman (1985) 246–262.

12 This aspect is discussed more elaborately by Lorenz (2007); cf. Neger (2012) 54–72.

In view of Martial's explicit and repeated evocation of Catullus and other Latin epigrammatists, such as Marsus, Pedo, and Gaetulicus,[13] it is striking that the vast field of Greek epigram is almost entirely ignored. This appears even more remarkable, if one considers that Catullus himself clearly signals his debt to Greek epigram: for instance, in *Carmina* 1–5, he evokes the preface to Meleager's *Stephanos* and the four most important epigrammatic sub-types (epideictic, funerary, dedicatory, and erotic) which in all likelihood constitute the four books of Meleager's anthology;[14] later in his corpus Catullus, moreover, explicitly refers to Callimachus (Catul. 65.16 and 116.2). In Martial's oeuvre, by way of contrast, there is only a single poem which mentions a contemporary named Bruttianus and compares his talent as an epigrammatist to that of Callimachus, claiming that he surpasses the Hellenistic poet:

> Dum tu lenta nimis diuque quaeris
> quis primus tibi quisue sit secundus
> Graium quos epigramma comparauit,
> palmam Callimachus, Thalia, de se
> facundo dedit ipse Bruttiano.[15]
> qui si Cecropio satur lepore
> Romanae sale luserit Mineruae,
> illi me facias precor secundum. (Mart. 4.23)

> As you, Thalia, investigate too leisurely and too long which of the Greeks whom epigram has set in competition you should put in first place and which in second, Callimachus himself conceded the palm to eloquent Bruttianus. If, replete with Attic wit, he toys with the salt of Roman Minerva, I beg you make me second to him.

This is the only instance where Martial mentions Callimachus as an epigrammatist;[16] in 10.4, which will be discussed below the Hellenistic *poeta doctus* in a less flattering way appears as the composer of the *Aetia*, that is to say mythological poetry too remote from everyday life.[17] As an epigram-

---

13 Domitius Marsus is mentioned in Mart. 1 *praef.* 12; 2.71, 77; 4.29; 5.5; 7.29, 99; 8.55; Pedo in Mart. 1 *praef.* 13; 2.77; 5.5; 10.20; Gaetulicus only in Mart. 1 *praef.* 13.

14 Cf. Holzberg (2002a) 45 and (2002b) 27.

15 The reading *Bruttiano* is preferred by Moreno Soldevila (2006) 229–230 to *Brutiano* transmitted in the γ-group. On Mart 4.23 cf. Mindt (forthcoming).

16 On Mart. 4.23, see Cowan and Lóio in this volume, pp. 350 and 375–376. In *Ep*. 4.3.3–5, Pliny also cites Callimachus as an epigrammatist; a collection of epigrams ascribed to Callimachus is probably in ciruclation in the first century CE: cf. Gutzwiller (1998) 19 with n. 12; Citroni (2003) 14; Meyer (2005) 128–130; Neger (2012) 77–78.

17 In the Latin tradition, Callimachus is more commonly cited as an elegiac poet: cf.

matist, however, Callimachus is positively referred to in 4.23, but Martial mentions him only to praise the otherwise unknown Bruttianus,[18] to whom Callimachus has to give way in the field of Greek epigram.[19] The possibility that Bruttianus could decide to skip composing Greek and aspire the first rank in Latin epigram is only hypothetically surmised within a conditional clause (*si … luserit*). We have to assume, then, that Martial considers himself to be the only first-rate representative in the Latin tradition of the genre, having already surpassed Catullus, who is not mentioned in this poem.[20] Nevertheless, 4.23 in another respect is indebted to Catullus: whereas most of the Greek epigrammatists, including Callimachus, prefer the elegiac meter,[21] Martial composes his poem in hendecasyllables, thereby recalling the Catullan tradition. Moreover, the antithesis between *Cecropius lepos* and *sal Romanus* (4.23.6–7)[22] has led to the assumption that in Martial's times there exist two ways of composing epigrammatic poetry: a Roman tradition indebted to Catullus and a Greek tradition following in the footsteps of Callimachus.[23]

Apart from this passage, even though they are not explicitly mentioned, Greek epigrammatists are nonetheless present in Martial's work: repeatedly the Flavian poet directs the reader's attention to the literary tradition in which he positions himself through allusions to the various Greek epigrammatists and epigrammatic sub-types that flourish in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods. Thus, besides metapoetic statements, intertextual references are a more subtle way for a poet to reflect on his own status within a certain literary tradition and its cultural context. Explicit literary criticism as well as intertextual allusions are two strategies of dealing with the works of

Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.58; Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.253; Ov. *Am.* 2.4.19; Catul. 65.16 and 66. See Binder and Hamm (1998).

18 The identity of this poet has been subject to much speculation: Balland (1998) 51–53 thinks of him as the same person as Cerrinius (Mart. 8.18) and Lustricius Bruttianus (Plin. *Ep.* 6.22); cf. Syme (1988) 563–578. Conversely, Pertsch (1911) 7–8 doubts the historical existence of this character; cf. Duret (1986) 3230; Moreno Soldevila (2006) 229–230; Neger (2012) 79–83.

19 There seems to be a word-play with the Latin verb *comparare*, which here is used in a military sense (cf. *OLD* s.v. *comparo* 2b), and the meaning of the Greek name Callimachus ("fighting nobly"); cf. Moreno Soldevila (2006) 228.

20 This is striking, since in 10.78.16 Martial makes us believe that he still has to surpass Catullus.

21 Among the sixty-three epigrams of Callimachus (cf. Asper [2004] 459–495) only poems 37–40 Pfeiffer are composed in a meter other than elegiacs; cf. Citroni (2003) 8 and 21.

22 On the stylistic connotations of *sal* and *lepos*, cf. Lausberg (1982) 61–62; Swann (1994) 61; Moreno Soldevila (2006) 230.

23 Citroni (2003) 11–12; cf. Canobbio (2008) 182 n. 33.

other writers; taken together they form a kind of generic theory and literary history immanent in Martial's books.[24]

A fair amount of scholarship has been dedicated to examining the influence of Greek epigram on Martial.[25] Most of these studies list various thematic parallels or try to show where Martial imitates a Greek model or adds specifically Roman elements. Only rarely, however, the question has been asked how Martial deliberately recalls the Greek tradition of his genre within his efforts to establish his own literary program. As I cannot offer an exhaustive analysis of all relevant passages here, I would like to focus on a few examples to show Martial's strategies of exploiting Greek epigram.

Already the beginning of the the *liber spectaculorum*, which is commonly considered the earliest of Martial's epigram books,[26] alludes to a Greek model:

> Barbara pyramidum sileat miracula Memphis,
> Assyrius iactet nec Babylona labor;
> nec Triuiae templo molles laudentur Iones,
> dissimulet Delon cornibus ara frequens;
> aëre nec uacuo pendentia Mausolea
> laudibus immodicis Cares in astra ferant.
> omnis Caesareo cedit labor Amphitheatro,
> unum pro cunctis Fama loquetur opus. (Mart. *Sp.* 1)

> Let barbarous Memphis speak no more of the wonder of her pyramids, nor Assyrian toil boast of Babylon; nor let the soft Ionians be extolled for Trivia's temple; let the altar of many horns say naught of Delos; nor let the Carians exalt to the skies with extravagant praises the Mausoleum poised in empty air. All labor yields to Caesar's Amphitheater. Fame shall tell of one work in lieu of all.

In the opening priamel, the poem contrasts wonders of the world from the Orient (1–2) and Greece (3–6) to the *Amphitheatrum Flavium* (7–8). It has long been noted that the poem on the temple of Artemis at Ephesus,[27] ascribed to Antipater, is Martial's model:[28]

---

24 For the concept of "immanent literary history," cf. Schmidt (2001) and Farrell (2003).

25 Pertsch (1911); Prinz (1911); Autore (1937); Kruuse (1941); Helm (1955) 77–79; Laurens (1965), (1989), and (1992); Ehrhardt (1974); Siedschlag (1977); Burnikel (1980); Lausberg (1982) and (1984); Cameron (1982); Clua Serena (1987); Holzberg (1988) 42–47, (2002b) 19–23 and 28–32; Sullivan (1991) 78–93; Manzo (1995); Schneider (2000); Nisbet (2003) and (2007) 561–563; Fabbrini (2005); Höschele (2006) 58–61; Mattiacci (2007); Livingstone and Nisbet (2010) 105–108; Mindt (forthcoming); cf. Lorenz (2003) 248–253.

26 On the date of the *De spectaculis*, cf. Coleman (2006) xlv–lxiv.

27 Cf. *AP* 9.790.

28 Weinreich (1928) 1–9; cf. Lorenz (2002) 66; Coleman (2006) 3–4.

Καὶ κραναᾶς Βαβυλῶνος ἐπίδρομον ἅρμασι τεῖχος
καὶ τὸν ἐπ' Ἀλφειῷ Ζᾶνα κατηυγασάμην,
κάπων τ' αἰώρημα, καὶ Ἠελίοιο κολοσσόν,
καὶ μέγαν αἰπεινᾶν πυραμίδων κάματον,
μνᾶμά τε Μαυσωλοῖο πελώριον· ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἐσεῖδον
Ἀρτέμιδος νεφέων ἄχρι θέοντα δόμον,
κεῖνα μὲν ἠμαύρωτο, καὶ ἦν· Ἴδε, νόσφιν Ὀλύμπου
Ἅλιος οὐδέν πω τοῖον ἐπηυγάσατο. (*AP* 9.58)

I have set eyes on the wall of lofty Babylon on which is a road for chariots, and the statue of Zeus by the Alpheus, and the hanging gardens, and the colossus of the Sun, and the huge labor of the high pyramids, and the vast tomb of Mausolus; but when I saw the house of Artemis that mounted to the clouds, those other marvels lost their brilliancy, and I said: "Lo, apart from Olympus, the Sun never looked on anything so grand."

Unfortunately we cannot tell with certainty whether this epigram belongs to Antipater of Sidon, of the second century BCE, or to Antipater of Thessalonica, who lived under Augustus;[29] in other cases, where the question of authorship is less problematic, it seems as if the younger Antipater had the stronger influence on Martial.[30] The similarities between *Sp.* 1 and *AP* 9.58 regard content as well as style: both epigrammatists list the wonders of the world within a catalogue that is contrasted to the one and true wonder: the temple of Artemis at Ephesus and the *Caesareum Amphitheatrum* in Rome. But Martial also modifies Antipater's poem: topographically, he moves from the Orient to Greece and then to Rome, whereas Antipater evokes a foreign and a Greek miracle in alternative lines;[31] moreover, the Greek anaphora καὶ ... καὶ ... τε ... καὶ ... καὶ ... τε (1–5) is transformed into Latin *nec ... nec ... nec* (2–5), and where Antipater mentions monuments both from architecture and sculpture, Martial only lists architectural examples in *Sp.* 1. We do, however, encounter a Flavian version of the Greek Ἠελίοιο κολοσσός in the second poem of the *De spectaculis*, where Martial contrasts Flavian to Neronian Rome: *hic ubi sidereus propius uidet astra colossus ... inuidiosa feri radiabant atria regis* ("Where the starry colossus sees the constellations at close ... once gleamed the odious halls of a cruel monarch," *Sp.* 2.1–3). The *sidereus colossus* probably refers to the former statue of Nero, which might

29 Gow and Page (1968) 2.20–21 and 92–93 attribute the poem to the younger Antipater, whereas Weinreich (1928) 6 and Argentieri (2003) 124–125 favor an ascription to the Antipater of Sidon, because of the Doric dialect used.

30 Cf. Prinz (1911) 87.

31 Cf. Weinreich (1928) 7–8.

have originally stood in the *uestibulum* of the *Domus Aurea*, and which Vespasian is said to have transformed into a colossus of the Sun.[32]

Martial gives Antipater's poem a Flavian touch by integrating it into the opening sequence of his book (*Sp*. 1–3); there, on the one hand, the benefits of the Flavians are glorified, and, on the other hand, the Roman epigrammatist indirectly deals with his own role as a poet under the new emperors. It is striking that Martial, unlike Antipater, opens his catalogue with the pyramids (mentioned in the fourth line of Antipater's text) and thus draws the reader's attention to the beginning of Horace's famous *carmen*: *exegi monumentum aere perennius / regalique situ pyramidum altius* ("I have completed a monument more lasting than bronze and higher than the decaying pyramids of kings," Hor. *Carm*. 3.30.1–2).[33] Whereas Horace's *monumentum* as a metaphor stands for the first three books of the *Odes*, Martial speaks of a real contemporary *monumentum*: the Flavian Amphitheater.[34] Through this allusion to Horace, however, Martial suggests that this monument can also be read as a metaphor for his book which contains poems on various spectacles. Reading the *liber spectaculorum* is like participating in a theatrical show, and thus the beginning corresponds to other passages in Martial's oeuvre, where reading epigrams is compared to entering spaces like a theater, a temple, or the *triclinium* of a Saturnalian dinner-party.[35]

By alluding to a Greek model in *Sp*. 1 Martial indirectly demonstrates his indebtedness to the epigrammatic tradition;[36] at the same time, however, he self-consciously claims his own position within this tradition: apart from the Colosseum, the words *unum pro cunctis fama loquetur opus* (8) can also refer to Martial's literary *opus* that aims to outshine its predecessors.[37]

As we can see, some of Martial's encomiastic epigrams on the Flavian emperors also fulfill metapoetic aims. In other passages Martial formulates his literary principles more explicitly, thereby evoking various Greek models. In 10.4, for example, he programmatically rejects mythological bombast in favor of poetry that depicts daily life:

---

32 Cf. Suet. *Nero* 31.1; Plin. *Nat*. 34.45; Mart. 1.70.7–8. See Coleman (2006) 19–21.

33 For the allusion to Horace, cf. Weinreich (1928) 3 and Coleman (2006) 4.

34 For Martial's strategies of incorporating poetic metaphors into the literary materiality of his epigrams, cf. Roman (2001).

35 Cf. Mart. 1 *praef*. 15–16; 8 *praef*. 15–18; 11.2, 6, 15; 13.1–3; 14.1–2.

36 Cf. Lorenz (2002) 66.

37 Cf. Fearnley (1998) 13–17; Neger (2012) 76.

Qui legis Oedipoden caligantemque Thyesten,
Colchidas et Scyllas, quid nisi monstra legis?
quid tibi raptus Hylas, quid Parthenopaeus et Attis,
quid tibi dormitor proderit Endymion,
exutusue puer pinnis labentibus, aut qui
odit amatrices Hermaphroditus aquas?
quid te uana iuuant miserae ludibria chartae?
hoc lege, quod possit dicere uita 'meum est.'
non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque
inuenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit.
sed non uis, Mamurra, tuos cognoscere mores
nec te scire: legas Aetia Callimachi. (Mart. 10.4)

You that read of Oedipus and Thyestes in the dark and Colchian dames and Scyllas, of what do you read but monstrosities? What good will ravished Hylas be to you, or Parthenopaeus and Attis, or Endymion the sleeper, or the boy who was stripped of his dropping wings, or Hermaphroditus, who hates the amorous waters? What pleasure do you find in the empty sham of a wretched sheet? Read *this*, of which life can say: "It's mine." You won't find Centaurs here or Gorgons or Harpies: my page smacks of humanity. But you don't want to recognize your own behavior, Mamurra, or to know yourself: you should read the *Origins* of Callimachus.

Within a catalogue of questions Martial surveys several examples of hackneyed mythological topics[38] just to tell us that there is no use in reading about them. There is a funny contradiction between Martial's poetic statement and practice in this epigram: while rejecting these mythological topics, Martial dedicates the first half of the epigram to characters like Oedipus, Thyestes, Medea, and Scylla.[39] Oedipus, the famous tragic hero from Thebes, is a very apt figure with which to open this poem: as is well-known, his name means "the swollen-footed," and in the context of literary criticism the Greek term οἰδέω ("to swell") can also indicate inflated style[40] which stands in stark contrast to Martial's own literary program. The phrase "you that read of Oedipus" thus could also be understood as "you that read inflated verse (πόδας)."[41] Moreover, the epigrammatist jestingly imitates a moralizing pose, reminding us, for example, of instructions like those given by Xenophanes of Colophon (sixth century BCE) on the appropriate behavior at a symposium:

---

38 On this list, see Watson and Watson (2003) 95–99.

39 On the comic effect of this contradiction, see Lorenz (2002) 222.

40 Cf. Ar. *Ran.* 940; Plut. *Cic.* 26; [Longin.] 3.1, 4.

41 We may also read a similar allusion in *caligantemque Thyesten*: apart from the allusion to the *caligo* which arises after Thyestes eats his own children at the table of Atreus (cf. Sen. *Thy.* 993–995), *caligans* could also be understood as "dark, not clear" in a rhetorical sense like *obscurus*; cf. *OLD* s.v. *caligo* 8b.

οὔτε μάχας διέπει Τιτήνων οὔτε Γιγάντων,
  οὐδέ ⟨τι⟩ Κενταύρων, πλάσματα τῶν προτέρων,
ἢ στάσιας σφεδανάς· τοῖς οὐδὲν χρηστὸν ἔνεστι. (Xenoph. fr. 1.21–23)

He deals neither with the battles of Titans nor Giants nor Centaurs, fictions of old, nor furious conflicts—for there is no use in these.

Whereas the subjects of Xenophanes' criticism are poets like Homer and Hesiod,[42] Martial's epigram ends with a *para prosdokian*: by citing Callimachus' *Aetia* as an example of literary pomposity within his *recusatio*, Martial launches a polemic against the very text whose prologue has formed the chief model for the topos of *recusatio* in Latin literature, as Cowan discusses in this volume.[43]

Callimachean poetics is also mimicked elsewhere in Martial's corpus. In 2.86, for example, the Flavian epigrammatist criticizes the complicated *nugae* and *ineptiae* so typical of Hellenistic poets:

Quod nec carmine glorior supino
nec retro lego Sotaden cinaedum,
nusquam Graecula quod recantat echo
nec dictat mihi luculentus Attis
mollem debilitate galliambon,
non sum, Classice, iam malus poeta.
quid si per gracilis uias petauri
inuitum iubeas subire Ladan?
turpe est difficiles habere nugas
et stultus labor est ineptiarum.
scribat carmina circulis Palaemon,
me raris iuuat auribus placere. (Mart. 2.86)

I don't pride myself on palindromes or read pathic Sotades backwards. Nowhere does a Greekling echo sing answer, neither does pretty Attis dictate me a weakly effeminate galliambus. That does not automatically make me a bad poet, Classicus. Would you tell Ladas to mount against his will the narrow path of a trapeze? It is demeaning to make difficulties out of trifles and labor over frivolities is foolish. Let Palaemon write poems for the crowd. I like to please uncommon ears.

Martial here contrasts his own poetic ideals to those of Alexandrian and Neoteric writers; he paradoxically calls their literary products, which are usually characterized as compositions for a select readership,[44] as written for

42 Cf. Lesher (1992) 53 and Schäfer (1996) 146–162.
43 See pp. 351–352. Cf. Wimmel (1960); Hunter (2006); Nauta (2006) 40.
44 Cf. Hor. *S.* 1.4.22–23, *Carm.* 3.1.1; see Holzberg (2009) 56–61.

the crowd (11), whereas he himself claims to be satisfied with *rarae aures* (12). Thus, Martial contradicts his own numerous statements where he gloats about his popularity among readers *toto in orbe*.[45] Critics, who have read these lines biographically, believe that Martial, still at the beginning of his literary career, has to be modest in his claims.[46] In my opinion, however, literary criteria seem to play a more important role than biographic reasons: For the antithesis of the crowd (11) with an elitist audience (12) recalls Callimachean aesthetics, as, for example, expressed in the following:

Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθῳ
  χαίρω, τίς πολλοὺς ὧδε καὶ ὧδε φέρει·
μισῶ καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον, οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης
  πίνω· σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια.
Λυσανίη, σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλός—ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν
  τοῦτο σαφῶς, Ἠχώ φησί τις· 'ἄλλος ἔχει.'

(Callim. *Ep*. 28 Pfeiffer = *AP* 12.43)

I hate recycled poetry and get no pleasure
  from a road crowded with travelers this way and that.
I can't stand a boy who sleeps around, don't drink
  at public fountains, and loathe everything vulgar.
Now you, Lysaniës, sure are handsome … But before I've repeated
  "handsome," Echo's "and some … one else's" cuts me off.

There are several verbal connections between this poem and Martial's:[47] both poets affirm that they avoid a wide audience (cf. *AP* 12.43.2 ~ Mart. 2.86.12); the *circuli*, for whom Palaemon[48] is said to write his poems (2.86.11), recall the ποίημα κυκλικόν in Callimachus; and the *graciles uiae petauri* (2.86.7)[49] stand in contrast to the beaten track where the masses use to travel in Callimachus. In addition, Martial disapproves of the Greek echo, which effectively concludes Callimachus' poem.[50] His rejection of this kind

45 Cf. 1.1.2; 5.13.3; 6.64.6; 8.3.4; 9 *praef*., 97.1–4; 10.9.3–4; see Williams (2004) 260.

46 Citroni (1968) 286 and (1975) 22–23; Williams (2004) 260–261; Mattiacci and Perruccio (2007) 175–176.

47 As Cowan shows in this volume, Callim. *Ep*. 28 is also an intertext for Mart. 1.92; see pp. 345–371.

48 This is probably the grammarian Q. Remmius Palaemon, Quintilian's and Persius' teacher; cf. Suet. *Gram*. 23 on his poetic activities. See Baldwin (1995); Williams (2004) 264. *Circuli* are groups of people assembled as an audience; cf. *OLD* s.v. *circulus* 5.

49 It is not clear what exactly a *petaurum* is, but in this context it must be some kind of acrobatic equipment which demands bodily skills very different to those of a runner like Ladas, on whom cf. Williams (2004) 263.

50 In Callimachus' times αι (ναίχι) already seems to have been pronounced similarly to ε (ἔχει); cf. Wills (1996) 434 and Williams (2004) 262. On Callim. *Ep*. 28, see further Gow and

of Hellenistic refinement notwithstanding, however, Martial himself makes use of an echo only two poems later. In his annotation to the *Graecula echo* of 2.86.3, citing a later example from the *Anthologia Latina*, Shackelton Bailey observes: "*Versus echoici* seem to be elegiac verses in which the first words of the hexameter are repeated at the end of the couplet, as in *Anth. Lat.* 226–227 (Bailey = 234–235 Riese)."[51] This is exactly what we find in Mart. 2.88:

> *Nil recitas* et uis, Mamerce, poeta uideri.
> quidquid uis esto, dummodo *nil recites*. (Mart. 2.88)

> *You recite nothing* and want to be considered a poet, Mamercus. Be what you like, so long as *you recite nothing*.

After Martial's statements uttered in 2.86 this comes as a kind of *aprosdoketon*; having presented himself to his readers as an anti-Callimachus first, immediately afterwards he shows that he nevertheless is able to play the poetic games of the Hellenistic epigrammatist and his successors. As we could see in 2.86 and 88, Martial on the one hand dismisses exaggerated Hellenistic refinement, but on the other hand he converts it to his own poetic program; in the case of 2.88 the poetological and erotic context of Callimachus' *Epigram* has been transformed into a scoptic poem.

By contrast to Callimachus, whom Martial directly mentions, one of his most important predecessors in the field of scoptic epigram, the Neronian poet Lucillius,[52] is never explicitly named. This is striking, given the fact that Martial uses Lucillius' poems as models quite often,[53] and obviously the reader is expected to notice such allusions. For there are many instances where the Flavian poet alludes to Lucillius and the latter's texts are significant for the understanding of Martial's poems. I would like to mention one example, where Martial uses Lucillius' text as an intertextual "commentary" to his own epigram. In 5.53, Martial criticizes a certain Bassus for composing bombastic mythological poetry:

> Colchida quid scribis, quid scribis, amice, Thyesten?
> quo tibi uel Nioben, Basse, uel Andromachen?
> materia est, mihi crede, tuis aptissima chartis
> Deucalion uel, si non placet hic, Phaethon. (Mart. 5.53)

Page (1965) 156–157; Gutzwiller (1998) 218–219; Männlein-Robert (2007) 312–315; Pretagostini (2007).

51 Shackleton Bailey (1993) 195 n.b.

52 For Martial and Lucillius, cf. Burnikel (1980); Holzberg (2002b) 29–30 and 100–109; Nisbet (2003).

53 Holzberg (2002b) 29–30 counts at least seventeen examples where Martial alludes to Lucillius.

> Why do you write about her of Colchis? Why, friend, do you write about Thyestes? What is Niobe or Andromache to you, Bassus? The most appropriate theme for your pages, believe me, is Deucalion, or, if he is not to your liking, Phaethon.

Bassus obviously writes tragedies on Medea, Thyestes, Niobe, and Andromache.[54] The epigrammatist advises him to choose figures like Deucalion and Phaethon. What at first sight sounds like well-meant advice from one poet to another aquires a satiric tone when compared to its model:

> Γράψας Δευκαλίωνα, Μενέστρατε, καὶ Φαέθοντα
> ζητεῖς τίς τούτων ἄξιός ἐστι τίνος.
> τοῖς ἰδίοις αὐτοὺς τιμήσομεν· ἄξιος ὄντως
> ἐστὶ πυρὸς Φαέθων, Δευκαλίων δ' ὕδατος. (*AP* 11.214, Lucillius)

> Having painted Deucalion and Phaethon, Menestratus, you enquire which of them is worth anything. We will appraise them according to their own fate. Phaethon is truly worthy of the fire and Deucalion of the water.

It is not entirely clear whether Lucillius in his poem mocks a poet or a painter—the Greek word γράφειν can refer to both activities.[55] In the *Greek Anthology* the epigram is part of a sequence of poems on ζωγράφοι, so this text too might be about a painter. Martial, however, reduces the ambivalence of the Greek term to writing (*scribis*, 1; *tuis … chartis*, 3). Not only does he imitate content and length of the Greek epigram, but he also adds further mythological examples.[56] But only when we read Mart. 5.53 together with *AP* 11.214, it becomes clear that Martial recommends to Bassus either to throw his poems into water or to burn them.[57]

There seems to be at least one passage in Martial's corpus where we may find the Flavian poet implicitly reflecting on his relationship to his Greek model Lucillius. In 1.72 Martial has to deal with a plagiarist named Fidentinus:

> Nostris uersibus esse te poetam,
> Fidentine, putas cupisque credi?
> sic dentata sibi uidetur Aegle
> emptis ossibus Indicoque cornu;
> sic, quae nigrior est cadente moro,
> cerussata sibi placet Lycoris.

54 Cf. Canobbio (2011a) 446.
55 Cf. *LSJ* s.v. γράφω.
56 Cf. Burnikel (1980) 16–18.
57 Deucalion and Phaethon also appear in *AP* 11.104 and 131 in the context of Lucillius' mockery; cf. Rozema (1971) 208.

hac et tu ratione qua poeta es,
caluus cum fueris, eris comatus. (Mart. 1.72)

Fidentinus, do you take yourself for a poet on the strength of *my* verses and want it believed? Just so Aegle thinks she has teeth in virtue of purchased bones and Indian horn. Just so Lycoris, who is blacker than a falling mulberry, fancies herself in white lead. You too by the reasoning that makes you a poet will have a head of hair when you are bald.

Fidentinus is compared to various characters who have to compensate for their deformities by buying fake teeth, make-up, or hair. Similarly, the plagiarist tries to conceal his lacking poetic talent from his readers by using what does not belong to him, i.e., Martial's *uersus*. It is striking, however, that Martial himself within a poem that attacks a plagiarist uses someone else's intellectual product to a comic effect: the last lines of the epigram recall another poem of Lucillius:[58]

Τὰς τρίχας, ὦ Νίκυλλα, τινὲς βάπτειν σε λέγουσιν,
ἃς σὺ μελαινοτάτας ἐξ ἀγορᾶς ἐπρίω. (*AP* 11.68)

Some say, Nicylla, that you dye your hair, but you bought it as black as coal in the market.

By integrating the content of the Greek distich into the argument of his own epigram, Martial implicitly reflects on the difference between plagiarism and permitted literary allusion, which recalls the Elder Seneca's anecdote on Ovid's use of Virgil's text: *itaque fecisse illum quod in multis aliis uersibus Vergilii fecerat, non subripiendi causa, sed palam mutuandi, hoc animo ut uellet agnosci*. ("… and that as a result the poet did something he had done with many other lines of Virgil—with no thought of plagiarism, but meaning that his piece of open borrowing should be noticed," Sen. *Suas*. 3.7).

Apart from the scoptic tone of Lucillius' poetry, Martial also engages with the poets collected in Philip of Thessalonica's *Garland*.[59] In 1.110 we encounter a reader's reaction on the long epigram 1.109, where Martial in 23 lines had praised the little dog Issa:

Scribere me quereris, Velox, epigrammata longa.
ipse nil scribis: tu breuiora facis. (Mart. 1.110)

Velox, you complain that I write long epigrams, and yourself write nothing. You make shorter ones.[60]

---

58 Cf. Livingstone and Nisbet (2010) 106. Martial's 12.23 also imitates *AP* 11.68.

59 Gow and Page (1968) 1.xlv–xlix date this anthology to ca. 40 CE; cf. Lausberg (1982) 41. Cameron (1993) 56–65 assumes a publication under Nero.

60 Here I follow Lindsay's (1929^2) reading of *tu breuiora facis* as a statement, not a question,

Poem 1.109, which is the subject of Velox' criticism, with its length, hendecasyllabic meter, and its playfulness strongly evokes Catullus' polymetric poems.[61] Different to Catullus and Martial, Velox does not approve of *epigrammata longa*;[62] Martial mockingly characterizes him as someone who cultivates the ideal of *breuitas* to such a degree that he writes nothing at all.[63] Moreover, Martial refutes his adversary's reproval not only explicitly but also implicitly, that is to say, in a manner as short as possible:[64] the hexameter talks about Velox' criticism, whereas the two halves of the pentameter comprise Martial's comment and the epigram's punch line. Velox seems to represent an epigrammatic ideal which is also expressed in the *Garland*: most of the collected epigrams are limited to a maximum of eight lines,[65] and the ideal of ὀλιγοστιχίη is emphatically recommended by the poet Parmenion:

> Φημὶ πολυστιχίην ἐπιγράμματος οὐ κατὰ Μούσας
> εἶναι. μὴ ζητεῖτ' ἐν σταδίῳ δόλιχον·
> πόλλ' ἀνακυκλοῦται δολιχὸς δρόμος· ἐν σταδίῳ δὲ
> ὀξὺς ἐλαυνόμενος πνεύματός ἐστι τόνος. (*AP* 9.342)

> An epigram of many lines does not, I say, conform to the Muses' law. Seek not the long course in the short stadion. The long race has many rounds, but in the stadion sharp and short is the strain on the wind.

Parmenion adheres strictly to his instructions, for in the *Garland* none of his epigrams exceeds four lines.[66] It might be too speculative to think of a direct allusion in Mart. 1.110 to Parmenion's poem, but in my opinion it seems likely that the theoretical discussion and the literary practice in Philip's *Garland* somehow must have influenced Martial's poetic statements.[67] In view of this it is also striking that in Martial's book 1, after the ideal of exaggerated brevity

---

as Shackleton Bailey (1993) does. If read as a question, the epigram's punchline would be much weaker.

[61] Cf. Fitzgerald (2007) 185 and Neger (2012) 65–68.

[62] In the polymetric compositions of Catullus, poems often comprise twenty or more verses (Catul. 4, 10–11, 14, 17, 22–23, 29, 34, 36–37, 39, 42, 44–45, 50, 55, 76). Morelli (2008) 22–23 offers a statistical analysis of the length of Catullus' and Martial's poems.

[63] *Velox* ("rapid, speedy") can also mean "short" in a rhetorical context; cf. Lausberg (1982) 44 and Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.45.

[64] Cf. Lausberg (1982) 45.

[65] The only exception is *AP* 9.26 (Antipater of Thessalonica); see Gow and Page (1968) 1.xxxvii; Lausberg (1982) 41; Grewing (1997) 427; Morelli (2008) 20.

[66] Cf. Lausberg (1982) 39–40 and Grewing (1997) 427.

[67] Cf. Newman (1989) 254–255; Grewing (1997) 428; Obermayer (1998) 12–13; Watson and Watson (2003) 76–77.

has been mocked in 1.110, there follows a sequence of six epigrams which, like the poems of Philip's *Garland*, never exceed eight lines (Mart. 1.111–116), before we encounter a longer poem in hendecasyllables again (1.117); and in 1.118, as in 1.110, the problem of brevity (this time regarding the whole book) resurfaces within only two lines.

As we can see, Martial reflects on his status in the epigrammatic tradition via explicit statements as well as hidden references to the Greek epigrammatic tradition. In addition to the poetry of Callimachus, Antipater, Lucillius, and the epigrammatists collected in the *Garland*, Martial also recalls the Greek sub-genre of epigrams on poets.[68] At the beginning of the eighth book, which is dedicated to the emperor Domitian (cf. 8 *praef.*), Martial has to be persuaded by his Muse in 8.3 to continue writing epigram instead of turning towards higher genres, such as epic and tragedy. As several scholars have observed, this poem plays with various motifs from Augustan literature, particularly Ovid's *Amores* 3.1,[69] where the personified elegy has to keep her poet from defecting to tragedy.[70] But there is also an allusion to a Greek text; in the final lines, the Muse dictates the following poetic program to Martial:

at tu Romano lepidos sale tinge libellos:
 adgnoscat mores uita legatque suos.
angusta cantare licet uidearis auena,
 dum tua multorum vincat avena tubas. (Mart. 8.3.19–22)

But do *you* dip your witty little books in Roman salt; let life recognize and read of her ways. Never mind if you seem to sing with a narrow pipe, so long as your pipe outmatches many people's trumpets.

In epic manner Thalia summons the epigrammatist to spice up his poetry with Roman salt (cf. Anchises in Virg. *Aen.* 6.851)[71] before she concludes her speech with a comparison between the *angusta auena* as a symbol for small-scale poetry[72] and the *multorum tubae*, which stand for epic and tragedy. Martial's Muse of epigrammatic poetry thus reverses the line of thought we encounter in an epigram of Antipater on Pindar:

Νεβρείων ὁπόσον σάλπιγξ ὑπερίαχεν αὐλῶν,
 τόσσον ὑπὲρ πάσας ἔκραγε σεῖο χέλυς· (*APl* 305.1–2)

[68] For Hellenistic epigrams on poets, cf. Gabathuler (1937).
[69] Cf. Lorenz (2002) 174–175; Canobbio (2005) 138–145; Neger (2012) 150–156.
[70] On *Am.* 3.1, cf. Holzberg (1997) 68; Bretzigheimer (2001) 61–76.
[71] Cf. Höschele (2013) 256–257.
[72] Cf. Tityrus' *tenuis auena* in Virg. *Ecl.* 1.2 and the *tenuis harundo* in *Ecl.* 6.8; Schöffel (2002) 118.

As much as the trumpet out-peals the fawn-bone flute, so much does your lyre out-ring all others.

Again, as in the case of 9.58, it is not clear whether this epigram was written by Antipater of Sidon or of Thessalonica.[73] Pindar's lyric poetry is praised through a comparison with the power of the war-trumpet that drowns out the flute. In Martial's epigram, on the other hand, the αὐλός / *auena* is expected to beat the trumpet. Thus, the Flavian muse in her speech recalls the Greek sub-genre of epigrams on famous poets, thereby elevating Martial to a new Pindar in the field of epigram. This is a very appropriate beginning for a book that is dedicated to the emperor Domitian and contains many panegyric elements. Without having to give up composing epigrams, Martial can now compete with epinician poetry.

Greek epigrams are also used by Martial in the context of consolation. On the death of Silius Italicus' younger son Severus (9.86), Martial presents himself bemoaning the *mors immatura* together with Apollo and the muses (3). Within Apollo's consolatory speech Silius is paralleled with Apollo himself and his sister Calliope, both of whom are said to have lost their sons, Linus and Orpheus (4–6), as well as with Jupiter and Domitian, whose children have also died (7–8).[74] Apollo concludes his speech with the following words

numina cum uideas duris obnoxia Fatis,
inuidia possis exonerare deos. (Mart. 9.86.9–10)

When you see divinities subject to the harsh Fates, you may relieve the gods of odium.

In the course of his consolation, Apollo speaks of the inevitability of fate even for gods, possibly alluding to Silius' Stoicism.[75] But the last distich is also reminiscent of the tradition of Greek funerary epigram, for Apollo's words recall the concluding lines of a poem by Antipater of Sidon on the death of Orpheus:[76]

τί φθιμένοις στοναχεῦμεν ἐφ' υἱάσιν, ἀνίκ' ἀλαλκεῖν
τῶν παίδων Ἀΐδην οὐδὲ θεοῖς δύναμις; (*AP* 7.8.7–8)

---

73 Gow and Page (1968) 2.21 and 78–79 attribute the poem to Antipater of Thessalonica, Argentieri (2003) 166–167 to the Sidonian.

74 In the case of Jupiter, we probably have to think of Sarpedon. On Domitian's son, cf. Suet. *Dom.* 3.1; see Vessey (1974) 115 and Henriksén (2012) 339–341.

75 This was suggested by Vessey (1974) 115. On the junction *duris obnoxia fatis* (9), cf. Luc. 9.336.

76 See Gow and Page (1965) 2.42; Argentieri (2003) 85.

> Why sigh we for our dead sons, when not even the gods have power to protect their children from death?

In Martial's epigram, the epic poet Silius Italicus is fittingly comforted by the god of poetry himself together with Calliope, the Muse in charge of the epic genre.[77] Within his consolation for the epicist, however, Apollo presents himself as very aware of the Greek tradition of funerary epigram as well.[78]

In my analysis, I have demonstrated how Martial deploys many strategies of integrating Greek epigram into the context of his books. Greek texts do not only serve as models but are often exploited in programmatic passages to serve Martial's efforts to establish himself as an epigrammatist. Allusions to Greek models can direct the reader's attention to the literary tradition to which Martial is indebted; at the same time, the Urtext serves as a foil for Martial to display his own literary program and distinguish himself from his predecessors. Martial's intimate familiarity with Greek literature is also indicated by allusions to *termini technici* of Greek literary criticism, as for example in 10.4.1. Writers of scoptic epigram, such as Lucillius, are not only used as suppliers of topics and motives. Martial expects his readers to recognize how he modifies Lucillius' texts—the Greek pre-text can even be important for the understanding of the meaning of Martial's poems. Among the various sub-types of epigrammatic poetry, Greek epigrams on poets are also utilized by Martial for his self-canonization (8.3). Far from being a mere copyist of Greek poets, the Flavian poet creatively deals with his predecessors, thereby establishing himself within the history of the genre.

77 Cf. Stat. *Silu*. 2.7.36–37, *Theb*. 8.373–374; see Newlands (2011) 233.

78 In Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Apollo is also portrayed as an epigrammatist, after the death of Hyacinthus (10.214–216); cf. Hinds (2007) 143–144.

FINGERING CESTOS: MARTIAL'S CATULLUS' CALLIMACHUS

Robert Cowan

In memoriam A.S. Hollis[*]

1. *The Flavian Shadow of Callimachus* (*Seen Through a Window*)

Roman Alexandrianism did not die with Ovid, but one would sometimes be forgiven for thinking so.[1] Flavian scholars know the truth. Those working on Martial and the *Siluae* routinely deal with their Hellenistic intertexts and aesthetics, and even among studies of the epics, the shadow of Apollonius lies long over Valerius Flaccus, while Charles McNelis has shown how important a figure Callimachus is in Statius' *Thebaid*.[2] Yet those looking through the other end of the telescope, surveying the reception of Hellenistic poetry at Rome, almost invariably stop at the end of the Augustan period.[3] Not all are as brusque and dismissive as Walter Wimmel who sees Statius' employment of the "conventional gestures" of Callimachean poetics expressing

---

[*] This article is dedicated, with great affection, to the memory of Adrian Hollis, *uir bonus docendi peritus*, who introduced me to Callimachus and taught me to look for him everywhere.

[1] Versions of this paper were delivered at the Delphi conference and at the 34th annual conference of the Australasian Society for Classical Studies (*ASCS* 34), at Macquarie University / Sydney Grammar School, January 2013. I am grateful to both audiences for their questions and suggestions (not limited to those explicitly acknowledged in footnotes), and to Maxine Lewis, Roger Pitcher, and Lindsay Watson for their comments on a written draft. It is produced in association with the University of Sydney Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Collaborative Research Group, *Writing the World: Transnationalism and Translation in Literary Studies*.

[2] E.g., *Siluae*: Newlands (1991) and (2002); Gibson (2006) xxiii–xxviii; Lóio (2012). *Siluae* and Martial: Fabbrini (2005); McNelis (2008). Valerius: Venini (1971); Bessone (1991); Galli (2007b); Finkmann, Krasne, Seal, and Van der Schuur in this volume, pp. 33–48 and 73–135. *Thebaid*: McNelis (2007); Chinn (2011); Bessone in this volume, pp. 215–233. On Martial and Callimachus, see n.20 below.

[3] Honorable exceptions are the inclusion of *Silu.* 3.1 among Roman receptions of the *Victoria Berenices* by Thomas (1983) 103–105, and of the influence of the *Hymn to Apollo* on *Silu.* 5.1 among "some allusions to Callimachus in Latin poetry" by Heyworth (1994) 67–69.

"the total meaninglessness" to which the form of the aesthetic *apologia* has fallen.[4] Some, like Richard Hunter, simply focus on "Roman poetry of the late republic and early empire" and tacitly exclude later texts.[5] Not infrequently, however, some kind of apology or justification is offered. Benjamin Acosta-Hughes and Susan Stephens' delimit their recent exploration of Callimachus and his ancient reception thus: "The upper boundary for our discussion is the later Augustans because poets like Propertius and Ovid have had a much greater impact in forming the prevailing views of Callimachus than poets of the Silver age."[6] Their emphasis on the formative role of the Augustan (and, we might add, Neoteric) poets in the reception of Callimachus and the construction of an idea of Callimacheanism is significant. A similar point was made twenty-five years earlier by Gregory Hutchinson in the final chapter of his *Hellenistic Poetry*, devoted to "Roman Poetry," but Hutchinson elaborated his justification further in a very suggestive manner:

> I have restricted my horizons, not because I think later Roman poetry less important, but because after Ovid the subject becomes difficult to write about. Clearly the Hellenistic poets did not cease to be read and used … But more fundamental influence it is hard to establish, in isolation from the influence of Roman works influenced by Hellenistic poetry.[7]

What Hutchinson identifies is a very real issue, but it is less clear that it is a problem rather than an opportunity. While it is undeniably hard to isolate direct Hellenistic influence from that mediated through Alexandrianizing Neoteric and Augustan poetry, we might ask ourselves why it should be necessary to isolate it.[8] Flavian poets were influenced by Hellenistic poets, by the Roman poets who had received them, and by the very mode of that reception. This is in itself a promising field of study.

What I am proposing is a larger-scale equivalent of what has become known as "double" or "window allusion," broadening the usual definition to encompass cases in which Flavian poets imitate and thus interpret (tendentiously or otherwise) by means of an intermediate text not merely a specific

---

4 Wimmel (1960) 319: "[Statius] verrät mit all seinen biederen Gesten die völlige Bedeutungslosigkeit, zu welcher die apologetische Form als Form der Diskussion, des Kampfes und der Klärung samt ihrem Lehrgehalt inzwischen abgesunken ist."

5 Hunter (2006) 141. Likewise the "Roman epilogue" of Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 444–485. Clausen (1964) does not go past Virgil.

6 Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012) 205 n. 4.

7 Hutchinson (1988) 353.

8 It might be added that it is also hard to isolate the direct influence of Hellenistic poetry on Augustan works from that mediated through the Neoterics.

antecedent, but a whole aesthetic. In this I take as axiomatic and requiring no further justification (since skeptics are unlikely to be won over in the scope I could allow for such justification) that every act of imitation is an act of interpretation, and that such acts of creative imitation can be used to construct literary histories, however tendentiously.[9] J.C. McKeown's term "double allusion," although he defines it as "the simultaneous allusion to two antecedents, one of which is based on the other" could on its own suggest a simultaneous allusion to two antecedents which do not themselves allude one to the other.[10] The term "window allusion," though it runs the slight risk of eliding the intermediate text as a colorless, transparent medium which the target text "looks through" to the "real" source text, is nevertheless more evocative of the complex interrelation of the three (or more) texts.[11] The essence of the window allusion is not simply that it alludes both to a text and to that text's own source text, but that it alludes to the very act of allusion between them. At the simplest level, it annotates the fact that there is such a relationship between its two source texts, an instance of "imitation as learning."[12] Thus, to choose a well-known example, the opening lines of Catullus 64 are a window allusion to the prologue of Euripides' *Medea* through that of Ennius' *Medea exul*, and by alluding to both texts, signal the poet's awareness that Ennius is himself alluding to Euripides.[13] Yet the window allusion does not allude simply to both source texts but to the space, the relationship, the dynamic between them. In the case of poem 64, Catullus, among other things, draws attention by imitation to Ennius' "correction" of Euripides' notorious *hysteron proteron*, so that the Argo sails *after* the felling of the trees from which it is built, In doing so, the Neoteric poet is

---

9 See most influentially Hinds (1998), esp. 52–98 on "literary history and its narratives".

10 McKeown (1987) 37–45. Indeed, "double allusion" is often used in this sense, esp. outside Classics, as in Ramachandran's (2007: 194–195) reference to Tasso's "double allusion" to two of Petrarch's *Rime Sparse*, a phenomenon which Classicists, following Hardie (1989), tend to call "combinatorial imitation."

11 The term is adumbrated by the suggestion in Cairns (1979) 63 (cf. Cairns [1989] 195) that "Tibullus … "looked through" [a Hellenistic predecessor] to his model and combined the two in his own work" but seems to have been adapted from Thomas' (1986: 188–189) more influential discussion of "window reference."

12 The title of the second chapter of Cairns (1979), which concludes with reflections on window allusion.

13 On this triangulation, see esp. Biondi (1980); Arkins (1982); Thomas (1982); Zetzel (1983). In order to keep my paradigm (relatively) simple, I omit (but, as Maxine Lewis rightly insists, must not fail to mention) the important engagement with Apollonius in the opening lines, as throughout 64, on which see esp. Clare (1997).

drawing attention to the *way* in which Ennius receives, imitates and interprets Euripides, an act which is both paralleled and itself received, imitated and interpreted by Catullus.

There are many Flavian examples of such specific window allusions to Hellenistic (and other Greek) antecedents "through" earlier Roman intermediaries. When Statius employs the figures of Hercules and Molorcus in describing the building of Pollius Felix's temple of Hercules in *Siluae* 3.1, he is of course alluding directly to the *Victoria Berenices* which opened *Aetia* 3, but he is also alluding to the *proemio al mezzo* of *Georgics* 3 and, more importantly, Virgil's own act of allusion there to Callimachus.[14] Valerius Flaccus is particularly fond of alluding to, and restoring to an Argonautic context, Virgilian episodes which allude to Apollonius. Thus the boxing match between Amycus and Pollux imitates that of Dares and Entellus, that of Amykos and Polydeukes, and the former's imitation of the latter.[15] Valerius' Medea, of course, imitates the Virgilian Dido's imitation of the Apollonian Medea.[16] Less securely, it has plausibly been suggested that Silius' theoxeny of Bacchus by Falernus alludes both to Ovid's of Jupiter and Mercury by Philemon and Baucis, and to Eratosthenes' of Dionysus by Icarius in the *Erigone*.[17]

Each of these is significant and worthy of analysis in terms of its own specifics, but most if not all of them can also be taken as in some way synecdochic for the Flavian reception of the Roman reception of Hellenistic poetry. Yet I propose, without sacrificing the specificity of individual instances, to look for passages where Flavian poets, through creative (window) imitation, annotate the Roman reception of the Hellenistic aesthetic in more overtly broad terms. An element of subjectivity is inevitable, but I suggest that the search might most fruitfully begin with places where the Flavian poet looks through a window allusion to a programmatic passage which states, or has been made to state, a wider aesthetic principle. Such a broadening of the concept of "window allusion" to encompass the whole Callimachean aesthetic allows a change not only of the implications but

---

14 *Pace* Thomas (1983) 105, who claims "there is no suggestion of any direct Virgilian influence on *Siluae* 3.1," refuted by Newlands (1991). Though McNelis' formulation (2008: 265) lacks a sense of self-conscious remodelling, it does express the dynamic: "Vergil's subordination of athletic victories to cultural accomplishments modifies Callimachus' celebration of his queen's athletic (and political) success and paves the way for Statius to treat Vindex's cultural pursuits as a kind of victory."

15 Leigh (2010). Cf. Lovatt (2005) 143–162 for Statius' intertextual grappling with all three antecedents at *Theb.* 6.729–825.

16 Hardie (1989) 7; Hershkowitz (1998) 99; Zissos (2012) 109.

17 Hollis (1970) 122.

of the form of the allusion. Since it is not an individual passage but the aesthetic as a whole whose presence in the intermediate text is being creatively annotated, the specific Callimachean locus to which the Flavian poet alludes need not itself be alluded to by the Neoteric or Augustan poet. Rather it is possible for the Flavian author to allude to one Callimachean element in the Neoteric / Augustan text, and an entirely different passage of Callimachus himself, provided that both have a sufficiently emblematic status in the Roman reception of Callimachean aesthetic to make the window allusion recognizably "to" Alexandrianism "through" Roman Alexandrianism.[18] The power of Callimachus' Molorcus and his mousetrap to symbolize small-scale poetry vis-à-vis the epic magnitude of Heracles and the Nemean lion might suggest that *Siluae* 3.1 could be just such a text. However, *cui non dictus Molorcus*? In the spirit of Callimacheanism, I shall attempt an untrodden path and propose a window allusion to Callimachus through Catullus in an epigram of Martial where it has not previously been suspected. Before doing so, and thus examining Martial's Catullus' Callimachus, it will be worth reflecting briefly and separately on Martial's Catullus and Martial's Callimachus.[19]

2. *Martial's Callimachus and Martial's Catullus*

There are two major problems which face any discussion of Martial's Callimachus: Martial and Callimachus.[20] As Donald Lavigne, building on William Fitzgerald's assertion that "Martial [sc. unlike Pliny] … has no interest in maintaining a persona," has recently put it, "Martial, through his kaleidoscopic representation both of himself and his world, guarantees his poetic fame precisely because he is able to be both one and many."[21] So variegated and opportunistic is the voice of the epigrams, so contradictory the values and attitudes implied in them, that it is impossible to establish a single,

---

[18] More concretely, to anticipate my test case, I shall argue that Martial 1.92 alludes to Callimachean imagery in Catullus's Furius and Aurelius cycle and to Callimachus' fr. 1.1 as a synecdoche for that imagery, even though the Catullan poems do not themselves allude directly to the *Aetia*'s incipit.

[19] The third term, Catullus' Callimachus, is, for our purposes, less significant than Martial's reception and construction of it, but I shall attempt to measure that construction against the original at the end of the chapter.

[20] Martial and Callimachus: Spisak (1994); Knox (2006); Nauta (2006) 37–40; Neger (2012) 77–87; and Neger and Lóio in this volume, pp. 327–344 and 373–391.

[21] Fitzgerald (2007) 194 and Lavigne (2008) 276.

unified view of Callimachus, because it is impossible to establish a single, unified "Martial." In addition, Martial's Callimachus is not only mediated through but shaped by the Callimachus of Catullus, Virgil, Horace, Propertius, Ovid, and Persius, probably of Laevius, Gallus, Marsus, and others, unknowns both known and unknown. To some extent, there is no "Martial's Callimachus" separable from "Martial's Catullus' Callimachus," any more than Horace's Alcaeus can be separated from the Hellenistic scholarly and poetic shaping of archaic lyric.[22] Indeed, as a further layer of complexity, Martial's reception of Callimachus is mediated, not only through the Roman Neoteric and Augustan poets, but through late-Hellenistic and imperial Greek epigrammatists such as Lucillius, Antiphanes, and Philip, as we shall see below.[23] Yet, just as Horace still tries, or at least makes the gesture of trying, to reach over the Hellenistic period "back" to Alcaeus "himself," so Martial regularly invokes Callimachus and Callimachean poetics either directly or at least in a way which does not self-consciously draw attention to its mediation through earlier Roman poetry.

Callimachus may seem an obvious figure for Martial to invoke as a model and an authority, both as the acknowledged master of epigram and as almost the personification of the poetics of the small-scale. Yet, whether we attribute the phenomenon to the *poikilia* of Martial's personae or to a more coherent but complex position, his attitude to Callimachus is distinctly ambivalent. At times, he seems clearly (albeit with a degree of irony) to set himself up as a new Callimachus, as in 4.23, when he flatteringly has Callimachus place himself second to one Bruttianus among Greek epigrammatists, and prays that he himself might hold the same position, should Bruttianus try his hand at Latin poetry. Even here, however, there may be a careful alignment with (Martial's) Roman Catullus as against (Catullus') Greek Callimachus, as Bruttianus' Greek epigrams are associated with "Cecropian elegance" (*Cecropio ... lepore*, Mart. 4.23.6) perhaps evoking Catullus' aural "translation" of λεπτός as *lepidus* at 1.1, in contrast to the "wit of Roman Minerva" (*Romanae sale ... Mineruae*, 4.23.7) evoking the more individually Catullan quality of *sal*.[24] Elsewhere, the rejection of (aspects of) Callimacheanism is more overt, since though its ideals might match the scale of

---

22 On Horace's Alexandrian Alcaeus, see Feeney (1993) 44.

23 On Martial and Greek epigram in general, see esp. Sullivan (1991) 78–93; Neger (2012) 73–92 and in this volume, pp. 327–344.

24 See Swann (1994) 61–62. It is tempting to see a play in the linguistically versatile Bruttianus' name to Ennius reference to the "bilingual Bruttian" (*Bruttace bilingui*, Enn. *Ann.* 477 Skutsch).

Martial's epigrams, they do not fit their subject-matter quite so well.[25] With characteristic wit, therefore, Martial uses the form of the Callimachean recusatio to reject Callimacheanism:

> Qui legis Oedipoden caligantemque Thyesten,
> Colchidas et Scyllas, quid nisi monstra legis?
> quid tibi raptus Hylas, quid Parthenopaeus et Attis,
> quid tibi dormitor proderit Endymion?
> exutusue puer pinnis labentibus? aut qui
> odit amatrices Hermaphroditus aquas?
> quid te uana iuuant miserae ludibria chartae?
> hoc lege, quod possit dicere uita 'meum est.'
> non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas Harpyiasque
> inuenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit.
> sed non uis, Mamurra, tuos cognoscere mores
> nec te scire: legas Aetia Callimachi. (Mart. 10.4)

> You that read of Oedipus and Thyestes in the dark and Colchian dames and Scyllas, of what do you read but monstrosities? What good will ravished Hylas be to you, or Parthenopaeus and Attis, or Endymion the sleeper, or the boy who was stripped of his dropping wings, or Hermaphroditus, who hates the amorous waters? What pleasure do you find in the empty sham of a wretched sheet? Read *this*, of which life can say: "It's mine." You won't find Centaurs here or Gorgons or Harpies: my page smacks of humanity. But you don't want to recognize your own behavior, Mamurra, or to know yourself: you should read the *Aetia* of Callimachus.

This engagement with Callimacheanism works on several levels. On the simplest, there is a characteristically startling and amusing twist in the tail of the epigram, when the poem which the Callimachean *recusatio* deprecates is itself, not only *by* Callimachus, but the very text whose prologue had become the *locus classicus* for such *recusationes*, as Margot Neger has discussed in this volume.[26] In making this move, however, Martial is not innovating, for the same strategy was employed by Virgil in the *proemio al mezzo* of *Georgics* 3, where the Callimachean subject-matter of Busiris, Hylas and Delos is rejected in Callimachean terms: "all the rest have already been made commonplace" (*cetera … omnia iam uulgata*, Virg. *G.* 3.3–4).[27] In a sense, then, this is "Martial's Virgil's Callimachus," but there is a crucial

---

[25] Cf. Spisak's (1994) analysis of 6.61 and other epigrams (including 10.4) reasserting the importance of *ingenium* over Callimachean *ars*.

[26] See pp. 335–336. Cf. also Citroni (1968) 280; Watson and Watson (2003) 99.

[27] Thomas (1988) 38 (original emphasis): "The grounds for rejection are Callimachus' own … The Virgilian novelty is that it is *Callimachean* themes that have become commonplace."

difference between the ways in which the two Romans hoist the Alexandrian with his own petard. For Virgil (at the considerable risk of oversimplification), the move is to reject the apolitical and unepic subject-matter which Callimacheanism, at least as received and constructed by the Neoterics, represented, and thus paradoxically to take the untrodden path *back* to epic. For Martial, the subject-matter of Callimachus is to be rejected, not as insufficiently grand, but as too-much removed from (epigram's construction of) "real life." In order to reinforce this point, Martial combines the Virgilian rejection of Hellenistic themes with the satiric rejection of the themes of (high-flown and irrelevant) tragedy, so that 10.4 becomes almost a combinatorial imitation of the openings of *Georgics* 3 and Persius 5.[28] We might even detect a tendentious allusion to Callimachus' assertion at *Epigram* 27.4 (translated by Virgil above) σιχχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια. Earlier Latin poets such as Virgil took this hatred of common things as a rejection of themes made hackneyed by being repeatedly written about (and read), but Martial gives it a more literal sense by reclaiming epigram for subject-matter dealing with the mundanities but also the realities of the people, the *populus*, the δῆμος. His use of Callimachus against Callimachus is not just a witty conceit or a learned commentary on Virgil. It is an expression of the paradox that he wishes to reject one aspect of Callimacheanism, its remoteness from real life, while simultaneously not only retaining the Callimachean aesthetic of the humble and the small-scale, but pressing that aesthetic into symbolic service as representing his humble and small-scale subject-matter. Yet even here, Martial is not walking an untrodden path.

The reification of Callimachus' aesthetic imagery had a long and complex tradition in Roman poetry. On one level, the contrasting physical attractions of Quintia and Lesbia in Catullus 86, the muddy river from which the avaricious man drinks in Horace *Satire* 1.2, and the muddying of the river Langia's pure stream by the Argive army at Statius *Thebaid* (4.823–830) can all be taken as metaphors for the poetic qualities favored or deprecated by Callimachean aesthetics.[29] Poetry and poetics are what these passages are "really about." Yet we can and perhaps must, to appropriate Stephen Hinds' phrase concerning metaphors for allusion, "reverse the trope."[30] The

---

28 Thanks to Lindsay Watson for not allowing me lazily to class Oedipus and Thyestes as Hellenistic subject-matter.

29 Catullus: Papanghelis (1991). Horace: Freudenburg (1993) 158–160. Statius: McNelis (2007) 87–88; Parkes (2012) xxii–xxiii and 323.

30 Hinds (1998) 10–16.

evocation of Callimachean poetic ideals and their antitheses can be a way of talking about erotics and ethics just as much as vice versa. The beauty of Quintia and Lesbia *as women* can be informed by parallels with the beauties of poetry (we shall return to Catullus' embodied poetics below); in *Satires* 1, as I have argued elsewhere, "[e]thics, poetics, and indeed politics all intersect, or rather stand as parallel metaphors for each other as Horace—quite literally—espouses moderation in all things";[31] the undesirability of the epic poetry symbolized by Statius' muddy river can be a way of characterizing the *nefas* which is the (epic) expedition against Thebes. This complex dynamic in which erotics, ethics and other themes both trope and are troped by poetics can of course be traced back to Callimachus himself. The poverty of the poet in *Iambus* 3, a motif to which we shall return, oscillates between a poetic metaphor and an ethical theme.[32] Perhaps most strikingly, almost certainly most famously, and unquestionably most pertinently for our examination of Martial 1.92 below, *Epigram* 28, with its parallel hatred of the cyclical poem (ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, 1) and of the *eromenos* who sleeps around (μισῶ καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον, 3) leaves the reader in a position of exquisite uncertainty as to whether the lament over Lysanies' promiscuity is a way of talking about the desirability of novelty in poetry, or vice versa.[33] Martial's exploitation of the complex dynamic between Callimachean imagery and Callimachean themes is thus in itself a learned reception both of Callimachus' own poetry and of its earlier reception at Rome. Yet at the same time he self-consciously makes something new of it, adapting it to match his own social circumstances and poetic ideals. As Victoria Rimell eloquently puts it:

> The social determination and "cheapening" of literary activity inspires a new, comic take on neo-Callimachean aesthetics, so that smallness is motivated by pragmatic concerns, poverty is harsh and real, not a lifestyle choice, and tiny, intricate poems are not necessarily perfect and polished.[34]

This further tension between what Martial (at least thinks that he) finds, imitates and amplifies in earlier Alexandrianizing poetry and the extent to which he self-consciously adds to, distorts and perverts it lies at the center of the notion of "Martial's Catullus' Callimachus" and of the whole idea of

---

31 Cowan (2011) xxv.
32 Acosta-Hughes (2002) 225–232.
33 Cf. Cameron (1995) 387–399.
34 Rimell (2008) 10.

a Flavian "window allusion" through Neoteric and Augustan to Hellenistic poetry. To approach it, we must think a little about Martial's Catullus.

The relationship between Martial and Catullus is truly a subject as huge as the Assyrian river and is matched by a commensurate quantity of scholarship.[35] Our concern here will be with Martial not merely as an imitator of Catullus but as a creative commentator on him. Although I have already asserted that every act of imitation is an act of commentary, it is still possible to focus discussion on epigrams and passages where Martial is most overtly and self-consciously presenting an interpretation or appropriation of his Neoteric predecessor. The key question which must be asked—and which it may not be possible conclusively to answer—is when Martial is offering a learned commentary which genuinely illuminates Catullus' poetry, when he is offering a "sincere" but wrong-headed interpretation, and when he is self-consciously distorting and banalizing his model. The distinction between the first two scenarios is particularly blurred, and not only by the unknowability of authorial intention, since it is determined almost entirely by whether any given reader subjectively agrees with Martial or not. Because meaning is generated at the point of reception and is not immanent in the text, Catullus' poems have no "real" meaning which we can reconstruct, and an interpretation by Martial, however bizarre, might be considered every bit as valid as that by a modern scholar. However, before we descend into hermeneutic *aporia*, there are times when a case can be made that Martial is self-consciously and even self-advertizingly taking his model and distorting it into something quite different.[36] To choose a (hopefully) uncontroversial example, few would argue that Mart. 1.32, the famous *non amo te, Sabidi*, illuminates any aspect of Catullus' reflections on his emotions towards Lesbia in Catul. 85, *odi et amo*. 1.32's clear evocation of 85 is rather a self-conscious distortion whose point lies not in amplifying anything present in the source text but rather in making it, through imitation, precisely something that it is not.[37] Not all cases, however, are quite so clear-cut. Are Bassa's malodorous farts in Martial's 4.87 a scatological banalization of Lesbia's fragrant

---

35 A non-exhaustive list: Ferguson (1963); Pitcher (1982); Urso (1992); Swann (1994) and (1998); Summers (2001); L.C. Watson (2003); Fedeli (2004); Fitzgerald (2007) 167–186; Lorenz (2007); Neger (2012) 54–73.

36 Sullivan (1991) 96: "Martial is quite capable of parodying Catullus and using some of his most elevated thoughts and phrases in banal or comic contexts"; Neger (2012) 132: "Daneben greift Martial auch andere Aspekte aus Catulls Gedichten auf und verlagert sie in einen banaleren, häufig skoptischen Kontext."

37 On the imitation, see Lorenz (2007) 418, with further bibliography.

unguentum in Catullus' 13.11–14, or a signal that Catullus was offering something less savory to Fabullus?[38] Another example is Martial's imitation in multiple epigrams of Catullus' *passer* poems. In many (though, as Roger Pitcher has demonstrated, by no means all), Martial's reference either to *passer* tout court or to *passer Catulli* has a clear sexual connotation.[39] Should, however, this be taken as creative commentary, as evidence, if not necessarily that Catullus meant penis when he wrote *passer*, at least that Martial "genuinely" thought he did?[40] Or is this rather an act of what Fitzgerald terms "banalization" and intended to be perceived as such, as in 1.109's allusion to Catullus 2 and 3, where the "complicated, fluid relations between the desire of Catullus for Lesbia, the desire of Lesbia for Catullus, and the sparrow through which they both play with that desire … have been reduced to the simple urge to pee, managed by good house-training."[41] Though there is still a degree of slippage between all three scenarios, it is of some significance for the study of the Flavian reception of the Neoteric / Augustan reception of Hellenistic poetics whether we consider Martial to be annotating what at the very least he *thought* was Catullus' engagement with Callimachus, or whether he was distorting that engagement and drawing attention to the distortion. The phrase "tendentious interpretation" has an element of tautology about it, since all interpretations serve a rhetorical end, even if it is only to convince the reader of their own validity. However, as we finally turn to Martial's Catullus' Callimachus, we must keep in view the issue of whether Martial's "tendentious interpretations" are not merely tendentious but not even interpretations at all.

3. *Martial's Catullus' Callimachus*

A decade ago, Lindsay Watson urged on Martial scholars "the need for detailed intertextual study of the two epigrammatists, this being the procedure most likely to cast significant illumination upon Martial's creative engagement with Catullus."[42] In that spirit, I should like to explore Martial's

38 L.C. Watson (2003) 9 asserts: "From Martial's perspective the original perfume was, it would appear, exceedingly sweet-scented," but this assumes that the allusion must be distorting or at least antiphrastic, whereas there is nothing to rule out a more "straight" imitation. See his nn. 62 and 63 for bibliography on the nature of Lesbia's *unguentum*.

39 Pitcher (1982).

40 E.g., Lorenz (2007) 425.

41 Fitzgerald (2007) 185.

42 L.C. Watson (2003) 3.

“window allusion” to Catullus’ reception of Callimachus by looking closely at a single epigram:

> Saepe mihi queritur non siccis Cestos ocellis,
> tangi se digito, Mamuriane, tuo.
> non opus est digito: totum tibi Ceston habeto,
> si deest nil aliud, Mamuriane, tibi.
> sed si nec focus est nudi nec sponda grabati
> nec curtus Chiones Antiopesue calix,
> cerea si pendet lumbis et scripta lacerna
> dimidiasque nates Gallica paeda tegit,
> pasceris et nigrae solo nidore culinae
> et bibis inmundam cum cane pronus aquam:
> non culum, neque enim est culus, qui non cacat olim,
> sed fodiam digito qui superest oculum:
> nec me zelotypum nec dixeris esse malignum.
> denique pedica, Mamuriane, satur. (Mart. 1.92)

> Cestos often complains to me with tears in his eyes of being touched by your finger, Mamurianus. No need for the finger; have Cestos complete, Mamurianus, if he is all you lack. But if you have neither fireplace nor bare bedframe, nor broken cup of Chione or Antiope, if the cloak that hangs from your loins is yellowed and patched and a Gallic jacket covers half your buttocks if your only food is the smell of a blackened kitchen and you drink dirty water on your belly with the dog: why, I shall dig my finger into—not your ass, for an ass that never shits is none, but your remaining eye. And don’t call me jealous or malevolent. In fine, Mamurianus, sodomize on a full stomach.

As is universally acknowledged, Martial alludes in this epigram to four poems by Catullus, 15, 21, 23, and 24.[43] On the principle stated earlier that all imitation is interpretation, it follows that Martial is undertaking some kind of creative commentary on the Catullan poems to which he alludes. At the most basic level, his inclusion of elements from four separate poems by Catullus in a single epigram is an act of combinatorial imitation, which learnedly acknowledges (or tendentiously constructs) the interconnectedness of those poems as part of a Furius and Aurelius cycle, an interpretation which is shared by many modern scholars.[44] However, I wish to suggest that, by further combining imitation of the Furius and Aurelius cycle with an allusion to the *Aetia* prologue, Martial annotates or constructs a metapoetic

[43] Friedländer (1886) 220; Citroni (1975) 286; Howell (1980) 299.

[44] Combinatorial imitation as commentary: Hardie (1989). In Martial: Hinds (2007) 114–115. Furius and Aurelius cycle: Barwick (1958) 315; Richardson (1963); Tromaras (1987); Beck (1996) 154–288, esp. 275–288; Marsilio and Podlesney (2006).

dimension to that cycle which engages with Catullus' own complex engagement with Callimachus and Callimacheanism.

In 2006, Ruurd Nauta and Peter Knox more-or-less simultaneously noted that the opening words of Martial 1.107, *saepe mihi dicis, Luci carissime Iuli, / 'Scribe aliquid magnum: desidiosus homo es'* ("You often say to me, dearest Lucius Julius: 'Write something big. You are a lazybones'") are a direct Latin translation of what almost all scholars now confidently believe to be the first two words of the *Aetia* prologue as imperfectly preserved in *P. Oxy*. 2079 (fr. 1.1–2 Harder): πολλάκ]ι μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀ[οιδῇ, / νήιδε]ς οἳ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι … ("Often the Telchines mutter against me, against my poetry, they who ignorant of the Muse, were not born as her friend …").[45] This allusion is of course entirely appropriate in a *recusatio*, since imitations of the prologue (especially the epiphany of Apollo at lines 21–24) had been so used at least since Virgil's sixth *Eclogue*, and moreover the "something big" (*aliquid magnum*) clearly evokes the "single continuous song" (ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές, line 3) which the Telchines criticize Callimachus for not writing, especially if it evokes thoughts of similar polemics such as that against the "big book" (μέγα βιβλίον, fr. 465 Pfeiffer).[46] It can be noted that here too Martial has a distinctly ludic take on Callimacheanism, since his motivation for writing small-scale poetry is overwork and the absence of financial incentive rather than an aesthetic principle of λεπτότης, and munificent patronage such as Maecenas provided for Horace and Virgil would instantly prompt him to compose a μέγα βιβλίον, employing Callimachean *labor* (= πόνος) but in anti-Callimachean *pingue* (= παχύς) soil.[47] It is also worth noting that Catullus is the only other Roman poet whose extant works include such an allusion to the *Aetia*'s incipit (changing the pronoun from first to second person), in a poem which refers explicitly to Callimachus.[48] Knox cites Catullus 116 as a parallel for Martial's allusion, but when we consider the pervasiveness of the latter's imitation of the former, it would

---

[45] Nauta (2006) 37–38 and Knox (2006). The clinching evidence, in a scholion on *Od.* 2.50 (f. 20r = p. 80, 2 Dindorf) was adduced by Pontani (1999). See also now Harder (2012) 12–13.

[46] On the imagery of big and small in Callimachean poetics, see esp. Asper (1997) 135–156; *contra* Cameron (1995) esp. 303–338.

[47] Interestingly for our purposes, Martial also subverts a Roman (and arguably unCallimachean) addition to the *recusatio*, the mock-modest *culpa ingeni*; see Nauta (2006) 38: "frequent in the Latin tradition since Horace … Martial is not short of talent, he is short of money; *his recusatio* grounds the poetics of the small form in social and economic reality."

[48] Catul. 116.1–2: *saepe tibi studioso animo uenante requirens / carmina uti possem mittere Battiadae* … ("Though *often* seeking with a studious questing mind how to turn *for you* songs of Battiades …"); see Barchiesi (2005) 333–336.

perhaps be more appropriate to take it as a precedent, and even an intertext. Knox also mentions, hidden in a footnote and again purely in order to bolster his already unshakeable case about 1.107, that the latter "is one of only two instances in which a Latin poem begins with *saepe mihi*; the other, Mart. 1.92, apparently does not invoke Callimachus."[49] The extreme rarity of this *iunctura* at the beginnings of Latin poems certainly supports Knox's case both for the deliberateness (as opposed to a chance collocation) and for the recognizability (as opposed to a common phrase with so many intertexts that it has none) of the allusion in 1.107. But it also renders it very unlikely that its only other occurrence in Latin poetry, located in the same book of epigrams by the same poet, indeed only fifteen poems earlier in the carefully constructed *libellus*, should *not* also have some sort of connection with Callimachus.[50] The connection is not as straightforward as (on the surface, at least) with the *recusatio* in 1.107, because the narrow path to it leads through the corpus of Catullus.

To allude to the *Aetia* prologue is to enter into a debate about poetics. To combine an allusion to it with an imitation of Catullus' Furius and Aurelius cycle is to creatively annotate the latter as having a metapoetic subtext. Before proceeding to a detailed look at the epigram, it will be worth considering how far we are justified in reading Catullus in this way, or at least in reading Martial reading him so. In support of a metapoetic reading of Catullus' Furius and Aurelius cycle, or at least in support of its susceptibility of being so read (tendentiously or otherwise) by Martial, is the way in which other poems with ostensibly erotic or scoptic subject-matter have been interpreted metaphorically. To cite only two examples, Jennifer Ferris takes the gout and body odor of the addressee of 71 (and his *aemulus*) as metaphors for their metrical incompetence (*podagra* = a problem with [metrical] feet) and inferior compositions ("the *aemulus* stinks—as a poet"), and, as we have already seen, Theodore Papanghelis sees in the rival physical attributes of Quintia and Lesbia in 86 Callimachean metaphors for bad and good poetry.[51] Attractive as many of these interpretations are, in some ways the issue of whether they are convincing is beside the point. The important points are rather the *potential* for such a reading which they share

---

49 Knox (2006) 640 n. 10.

50 It might even be argued that the third word of 1.92, *queritur*, more closely evokes Callimachus' ἐπιτρύζουσιν than 1.107's neutral *dicis*.

51 Ferriss (2009), quoting from 380; Papanghelis (1991). For a more complex interplay of physical and metaphorical, see L.C. Watson's (2005) suggestion that Volusius' "shitty sheets" (*cacata charta*) in 36 are a "scatological recycling of Callimachus' muddy river" (270).

with the Furius and Aurelius cycle, and the *propensity* to produce such a reading which so many scholars share with Martial. However, it is worth noting that in one poem Catullus himself, implicitly at least, encourages such metapoetic interpretations of apparently non-poetological *carmina* by reifying a stylistic metaphor and thus blurring the boundaries between the critical and the physical. This is 44, where the metaphorical "frigidity" (*frigus*) of Sestius' speech is reified into a literal drop in temperature, which gives Catullus a cold while he is reading it.[52] Indeed Mark Williams has even argued that Catullus carries the joke over into the following poem, 45, where despite there being no such explicit indication of its being related to stylistic metaphor, the juxtaposition encourages the reader to take Amor's sneezes as being the result of catching a cold from the *frigus* of Acme and Septimius' overblown rhetoric.[53] While it is enough for our purposes that Martial is not alone in seeing poetry about poetry everywhere in the Catullan corpus, it is perhaps reassuring that both he and modern critics can point to at least some overt justification. Moreover, as we have seen with Lysanies and the cyclic poem in *Epigram* 27, they also have Callimachean precedent.

Moving from modern critics' metapoetic readings of Catullus to Martial's own, Craig Williams offers us a particularly pertinent example, inasmuch as it shows not simply Martial offering metapoetic readings of Catullus in general, but specifically of a poem from the Furius and Aurelius cycle.[54] As Williams demonstrates, the opening of Martial 1.52, *commendo tibi, Quintiane, nostros /—nostros dicere si tamen libellos / possum, quos recitat tuus poeta*—("Quintianus, I commend you my little books—that is, however, if I can call them *mine*, when your poet friend recites them," 1–3) figures Martial's *libellus* as a sexual partner and his plagiarist as a sexual rival by means of its allusion to the opening of Catullus 15 where a boy rather than a book is being entrusted: *commendo tibi me ac meos amores, / Aureli* ... ("I entrust to you myself and my beloved, Aurelius ...," Catul. 15.1). Williams' emphasis is very much on how the allusion to Catullus affects our reading of Martial, sexualizing the act of plagiarism, but, as Williams just hints, the intertextuality works in both directions, and the allusion by Martial simultaneously encourages a metapoetic interpretation of Catullus 15. Once again,

52 De Angeli (1969) attractively argues that the style of the poem in itself embodies and parodies the *frigus* it attacks.

53 Williams (1987–1988).

54 Williams (2002) 158–161. On sex as metaphor for poetry in Martial and Catullus, emphasizing phallic aggression rather than pathic receptivity, see also Hallett (1996).

Martial's creative annotation is paralleled by a modern critical interpretation, as William Fitzgerald compares Catullus 15 with poem 1, and suggests that "the problematic act of entrusting in poem 15 looks as if it might be a metaphor for publication."[55] The blurring of the boundary between sexual rival as (plagiarizing) poet and as (critical) reader of the boy-as-book is also significant for Mart. 1.92. As we finally move to a closer look at that epigram, it is interesting to note that Rimell's brief discussion of it, though she does not make the connection with a metapoetic reading of Catullus, let alone Callimachus, makes similar parallels between boy and book, molestation and publication, as "epigram identifies with both Cestos and Mamurianus, shrinking back from dirty fingers and sharp horns … and at the same time seeking ultimate sensual closeness with its readers."[56] However, I wish to suggest that 1.92 is not merely about the author's anxiety about his beautiful young *libellus*' being manhandled by any sort of reader, but rather—through the combinatorial allusion to the *Aetia* prologue—a reader of narrowly, parodically Callimachean views, and that Martial thus draws out such a meaning from (or retrojects it onto) Catullus' Furius and Aurelius cycle. Indeed Furius and Aurelius are explicitly attacked as critics of Catullus' poetry in 16 and, moreover, it is with attacks on Callimachean γραμματικοί in Greek epigram that we shall find the closest parallels for the interpretation I propose. Yet this image of Furius, Aurelius and Mamurianus as Callimachean *critics* is inextricably bound up with the image of them as *poets*. This is particularly the case if Catullus' Furius is indeed Furius Bibaculus, an interpretation which Shane Hawkins has recently argued that Martial annotates in 1.92 by punning on his cognomen in the vertically-juxtaposed words *bibis … culum* (same *sedes* in lines 10 and 11).[57] Of course, this double-role is itself a hallmark of the scholar-poets of Alexandria and the *docti poetae* of late republican and Augustan Rome, as well as being precisely that which Catullus and Martial are playing in their literary invectives.

Of the elements which Martial picks up from the invective aimed at Furius and Aurelius and which are particularly susceptible of metapoetic interpretation in perverted Callimachean terms, the most important, apart from sex, is the nexus of poverty, hunger, thinness and dryness. Hunger is

[55] Fitzgerald (1995) 47.

[56] Rimell (2005) 31. On the metapoetic materiality of Martial's books, see also Fowler (1995) and Roman (2001). On "a finger for a finger" justice in 1.92, see Obermayer (1998) 88. On the allusion in *non opus est digito* to Ov. *Ars* 1.137–138, see Hinds (2007) 120–121.

[57] Hawkins (2011) 258.

most prominent in the attack on Aurelius (*pater esuritionum*) in Catul. 21, dryness in that on Furius (*corpora sicciora cornu*) in 23. Poverty is explicit in the cross-referencing 23 and 24 (*cui neque seruus est neque arca*, 23.1 ~ 24.8) and can easily be read into 21 as the reason for Aurelius' hunger.[58] Of these, it is poverty which is most emphasized in Mart. 1.92. Poverty is a recurrent motif in Martial, and his depiction of it as a real need, in contrast to the pose of other poets, is one of his major themes.[59] Moreover, we have already seen, both in the specific example of 1.107 and in Rimell's overview of his "comic take on neo-Callimachean aesthetics," how Martial frequently reinvents the Alexandrian poetics of the small as an non-optional economy of scale. In this, he is developing an established *topos* whereby poverty is not merely the conventional lot of the poet, but a symbol of his humble, non-bombastic style. The *locus classicus* for the motif was Callimachus' third *Iambus* and, although this poem itself engages closely with the theme of poverty in archaic iambos, it was the connection with Callimachus' poetics of λεπτότης which was to be so influential on Roman poetic imagery.[60] J.K. Newman noted in 1967 that "poverty is ... a stylistic and moral quality—stylistic, because the Callimachean poet rejects the luxury of the grand style, and moral, because in so doing he puts his conscience as an artist before the temptation to seek easy popularity with well-tried pieces." Just under twenty-five years later, he described Catullus 24 as "a comic reversal of the usual poor poet topos, developed by Callimachus in his third *Iambos*," but without making the connection between his own two readings, that Furius is an inversion of the impoverished Callimachus of *Ia.* 3, not only in winning the boy from his wealthy rival, but in being attacked rather than praised for his humble style.[61] Catullus (or at least Martial's Catullus) takes the polyvalent symbolism of the impoverished Callimachean lover-poet and exposes it to the more mainstream Greco-Roman moralizing condemnation of poverty, so that Furius' (and following him, Mamurianus') lovemaking as a literal poor *erastes* and his poetry as a metaphorical "poor poet" are simultaneously stigmatized.

58 *Pace* Peek (2002), who sees Aurelius' hunger as symbolizing sexual voracity rather than poverty, a connotation which is unquestionably also in play.

59 For reflections on the economic realities which Martial may reflect, see Tennant (2000).

60 Poverty, *Ia.* 3, and archaic iambos: Acosta-Hughes (2002) 225–232. Roman reception: Mette (1961); Newman (1967) 375; Bramble (1974) 159; Kerkhecker (1999) 70–71 n. 41.

61 Newman (1967) 375 and (1990) 177.

Thinness is not explicitly mentioned in any of the poems of the cycle (nor in Martial 1.92), but its axiomatic connection with hunger and a lack of food (a connection also made in metapoetic contexts, as we shall see) means that it can, with caution, be seen as implicit.[62] The reification of the slender style in the body of the thin poet has a long history stretching back to Old Comedy and is particularly associated with stories about Philetas.[63] The words used to describe the latter are frequently those used to characterize Callimachean ideals of style, ἰσχνός and λεπτός.[64] Had Catullus called Aurelius *tenuis* or Martial Mamurianus *macer*, as they could quite easily have done, the connection with Callimachean stylistics would have been easy to make.[65] However, the emphasis on their hunger and inability to eat properly connects to the way in which Callimachus himself formulated the idea of λεπτότης in the *Aetia* prologue. The physicality of the image and its connection with corporeal thinness is made clear by the way in which Apollo instructs the poet to keep, not his poetry in the abstract, but its embodiment in the Muse, slender (τὴ]ν Μοῦσαν δ' … λεπταλέην, fr. 1.24 Harder) in antithesis with the fatness of the sacrificial animal (τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον, 23). The influence of diet on this somato-stylistic quality is unfortunately left uncertain by the absence in *P. Oxy*. 2079 of the verb at the start of line 24 which governs both objects, but parallels at *Ia*. fr. 222.1–22 and Virg. *E*. 6.4–5 make it overwhelmingly likely that it was some word for "feed," whether Pfeiffer's θρέψαι or Rostagni's βόσκειν.[66] If so, the slenderness of Callimachus' style was figured as the result of a strict diet, a conceit which Hunter and others have noted would be foreshadowed by (and allude to) the regime of plain food/language and exercise whereby Euripides in Aristophanes' *Frogs*

62 Eden (1989) 121 suggests, in support of his interpretation of *scripta* (1.92.7) as "torn by chafing" that "[t]here may even be a hint that the wearer's grinding poverty had reduced his loins to bony protrusions, scraping and tearing his garment."

63 See esp. Cameron (1995) 488–493, though Spanoudakis (2002) 54–55 is cautious. Lucillius has a series of epigrams (*AP* 11.91–94) taking to comically absurd lengths the implications of their subjects' thinness but, although the first line of each poem ends by designating its subject ὁ λεπτός, it is not clear that there is any connection with Callimachean poetics.

64 E.g., Ael. *VH* 9.14, Athen. 552B.

65 Catullus plays on multiple connotations of *tenuis* at 85.1—as Harz (2007) 98–100 observes, quoting from 100, "is Gellius then 'subtle / elegant' or 'common / low' or simply 'thin'" ("ist Gellius nun 'feinsinnig / elegant' oder 'gemein / niedrig' oder einfach 'dünn'?")—but there is no obvious connection with poetics. Martial mentions plenty of thin people (e.g., *Thaida tenuem*, 11.101.1) and thin books (e.g., *macer libellus*, 2.6.10) but does not seem to have pointedly connected the two.

66 See Harder (2012) 2.61.

slimmed down the Art of Tragedy, bloated up by Aeschylus.[67] Such a positive image of a slimming diet as the route to desirable λεπτότης could easily be twisted into a scenario where the grim emaciation of poet and poetry is the result of hunger and poverty, and this is precisely what (Martial's) Catullus does.

Martial has no explicit reference to dryness to match Catullus' tour-de-force hyperbole at 23.12–14, but his outdoing of Furius' ten shits a year with Mamurianus' total constipation, as well as being in itself a clear marker of dehydration, is sufficient shorthand to suggest that the latter also surpasses him in desiccation.[68] Lawrence Richardson already identified something of the symbolic significance which "Furius' juiceless-ness" might have, marking that he lacks the "salty humours" which indicate "wit and appreciation."[69] More extensively, Maria Marsilio and Kate Podlesney have skillfully connected Furius' (apparently literal) dryness to the metaphorically arid style deprecated by critics of rhetoric, to argue that his "poetry is dry, unsophisticated and devoid of wit and taste."[70] They also note Catullus' positive use of the metaphor in poem 1, where his *libellus* is polished up with dry pumice (*arida … pumice*, 1.2), though without reference to William Batstone's important article, which demonstrates how the image of dryness there "precisely and subtly refers to the precise, careful, pure avoidance of error and excess—exactly what you need to polish a neo-Callimachean *libellus*."[71] However, it is hard to see how Marsilio and Podlesney come to the conclusion that "Catullus' uses of *aridus* in poems 1, 23 and 48 suggest the distinctions between Furius' and Catullus' poetry" (173) when, apart from tone, there is little to distinguish one dryness from the other. In which case, perhaps tone is the only difference, and it is the same Callimachean dryness of style which is valorized in poem 1 and ridiculed in 23. Dry Furius is being attacked, not merely for being a bad poet, but for being a Callimachean one.

It may seem paradoxical that Martial would use an allusion to the *Aetia*'s incipit to introduce an anti-Callimachean polemic (and to annotate another), but in doing so Martial (and Martial's Catullus) is employing the

---

67 Ar. *Ran*. 939–943, with Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 70 and n. 96 for further bibliography.

68 Dehydration: O'Bryhim (2007) 139, who further sees it as a metaphor for poverty rather than poetry (cf. Wray [2001] 74–75). In the context of Mamurianus' dryness, the reader might retrospectively see a further significance to the litotes *non siccis … ocellis* (1)—Cestos is not dry and hence unsuited to Mamurianus.

69 Richardson (1963) 98.

70 Marsilio and Podlesney (2006) 171–173, quoting from 173.

71 Batstone (1998) 132.

same technique as a number of (probably more-or-less contemporary) Greek epigrammatists in "picking up Callimachus' literary terms and hammering them into weapons."[72] Perhaps the most striking example of this is Philip's invective (*AP* 11.321) against pedantic grammarians, the "soldiers of Callimachus" (Καλλιμάχου στρατιῶται, 3), where it is the γραμματικοί themselves who are branded "Telchines towards books" (Τελχίνες βίβλων, 2) and they who mutter criticisms (κατατρύζοντες, *AP* 11.321.7 ~ Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν, *Aet.* fr. 1.1 Harder).[73] While there are elements of Mamurianus' being hoist with his own Callimachean petard in this fashion, the tendency in Martial (and his Catullus) is rather for qualities and metaphors which are positively valorized in (neo-)Callimachean aesthetics to be perverted into their negative analogues. A particularly striking example for our purposes is an epigram by Antiphanes, which may have influenced Philip, and in which the Callimachean γραμματικοί are characterized as "dry," and not in a good way:

γραμματικῶν περίεργα γένη, ῥιζώρυχα μούσης
  ἀλλοτρίης, ἀτυχεῖς σῆτες ἀκανθοβάται,
τῶν μεγάλων κηλῖδες, ἐπ᾽ Ἠρίννῃ δὲ κομῶντες,
  πικροὶ καὶ ξηροὶ Καλλιμάχου πρόκυνες,
ποιητῶν λῶβαι, παισὶ σκότος ἀρχομένοισιν,
  ἔρροιτ᾽, εὐφώνων λαθροδάκναι κόριες. (*AP* 11.322)

Idly curious race of grammarians, you who dig up by the roots the poetry of others; unhappy bookworms that walk on thorns, defilers of the great, proud of your Erinna, bitter and dry dogs set on by Callimachus, bane of poets, darkness to little beginners, away with you, bugs that secretly bite the eloquent.

The image of the γραμματικοί as "foredogs" (πρόκυνες) is particularly rich in associations, and interacts with a comparable richness in the connotations of their being "dry" (ξηροί). They are both flattering "lap-dogs" (*LSJ* s.v. προκύων II) in their attitude *towards* Callimachus and "snappers and snarlers" set on *by* him. Yet they are also the "winds which precede the rising of Sirius" (*LSJ* s.v. I.2) and this is one of the respects in which they are ξηροί, both dry in themselves and desiccating in their effect on the landscape in the dog-days of summer.[74] Yet ξηρός, especially taken in the wider context of the poem,

[72] DeForest (1994) 33.

[73] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 446: "This poem … contains a number of echoes of Callimachus' own critical language."

[74] This would fit with Gow and Page's rendering, "harsh", though their note (1968: 2.114) takes πρόκυνες as (multiples of?) the star (*LSJ* I.1): "they stand to [Callimachus] as Procyon to the Dog-star,—closely associated, but much dimmer."

must have a literary-critical sense relevant to the literal γραμματικοί as well as a meteorological one applicable to the metaphorical πρόκυνες. The connotations of ξηρός are perhaps most clearly brought out by its use in Pseudo-Demetrius' *De elocutione* to describe the "dry style" (χαρακτὴρ ξηρός) which is the "adjacent fault" of the desirable "plain style" (χαρακτὴρ ἰσχνός).[75] Pseudo-Demetrius' word for plain, ἰσχνός, is of course itself a metaphor which evokes two of the elements present in Martial 1.92 and the Furius and Aurelius cycle, dryness (*LSJ* s.v. 1) and thinness (*LSJ* s.v. 2). The relationship between the neutral-to-positive stylistic connotations of ἰσχνός and the clearly pejorative ones of ξηρός were reproduced in Latin metaphors of stylistic dryness, but without the distinction in terminology, so that both Catullus' pumice and Furius' body are *aridus*. A Callimachean could be complimented in Greek for having an ἰσχνός style or ridiculed for being ξηρός, whereas in Latin, with less flexibility but more pointedness and potency, he could be praised or blamed using exactly the same word.

In addition to the elements which Martial picks up and glosses from Catullus' cycle, there are other motifs in 1.92 which, like the allusion to the *Aetia*'s incipit itself, are not themselves present in Catullus, but fit with the Callimachean imagery which Martial sees there. Some of these are more obvious than others, and some depend on such subtle connections that their claim to carrying conviction, such as it is, must rest on their being part of a network of such imagery. It should of course be added that there may also be references to texts which have not survived, a caveat which should always be borne in mind when discussing allusions in classical texts, but one which is particularly significant when dealing with a poet like Callimachus, so much of whose work is lost. These further allusions, in keeping with Martial's poetics of opportunism, are employed in different and, by strict logic, contradictory ways, some turning Callimachean discourse against the Callimachean (as in *AP* 11.321 and related epigrams), some adopting and adapting the more obvious role of Callimachus' antagonist, and in one case implying that Mamurianus fails to live up to Callimachean ideals. The last of these techniques can be seen in Martial's allegation to Mamurianus: "you drink dirty water on your belly with the dog" (*bibis inmundam cum cane pronus aquam*, 10). In a Callimachean context, this is a clear reference to the end of the *Hymn to Apollo*, where the god responds to Phthonos' criticism of poetry which is not as large as the sea, by noting that the Euphrates is great

75 [Demetr.] *Eloc.* 190–235 (χαρακτὴρ ἰσχνός), 236–239 (ξηρός).

but muddy, in contrast to the small but pure spring of Demeter.[76] This image contrasting pure and muddy water was one of the most frequently exploited by Roman Alexandrianizing poets and would be readily recognizable, even when transferred to this incongruous context.[77] Martial here condemns Mamurianus, not only for the vices of being a Callimachean, but for failing even to be a proper Callimachean.[78]

The end of the *Hymn to Apollo*, in which personified Envy (Φθόνος) is so prominent, also lies, along with other passages such as the βασκανίη of *Aet.* fr. 1.17, behind Martial's insistence that Mamurianus "not call him jealous or malevolent" (*nec me zelotypum nec dixeris esse malignum*, 13). Although there is an important distinction between envy and (sexual) jealousy, as Ruth Caston has recently emphasized, yet there is, and was in classical times, a persistent tendency to conflate the two, so that we should not be surprised to find such slippage in an epigram where Martial is grabbing every conceivable invective missile.[79] Moreover, in terms of precise diction which Martial uses, the verbal cognates of ζηλότυπος and φθονερός were coupled as early as Plato's *Symposium* where Socrates describes Alcibiades as "feeling jealousy and envy towards me" (ζηλοτυπῶν με καὶ φθονῶν, 213d), and Elaine Fantham shows that the connotations of the noun ζηλοτυπία increasingly covered envy as well as jealousy from the first century BCE, though the adjective often retained its "more earthy associations with sex and violence."[80] *malignus* is frequently used of carping critics in general, a sense which Martial himself employs several times, including in the preface to the first book, and sometimes there is clear emphasis that the carping corresponds to the *inuidia* or *liuor* which Roman Callimacheans more frequently use to render φθόνος.[81]

---

76 Callim. *H.* 2.108–112.

77 E.g., Lucr. 1.927–928 = 4.2–3; Catul. 95.4–7; Hor. *S.* 1.4.11 and 1.10.50–51; Prop. 3.1.3; Ov. *Met.* 8.549–559, with Wimmel (1960) 222–233. Cf. L.C. Watson (2005) on Catul. 36.

78 The detail of the dog may also allude to Callimachus. There is almost certainly a metapoetic significance to the claim at *Ia.* 2.10 that Eudemus has a dog's voice (καὶ κυνὸς [μ]έ[ν] Εὔδημος), which Bramble (1974) 115–116 sees as lying behind the tongue of the thirsty dog at Pers. 1.60. At *Ia.* 1.82–83, "but your Korykian will curl up his tongue like a drinking dog and gape behind your back, saying …" (ὁ δ' ἐξόπισθε Κωρυκαῖος ἐγχάσκει / τὴν γλῶσσαν †ελων ὡς κύων ὅταν πίνῃ), the parallel is very close but the context entirely lost, though Kerkhecker (1999) 46 does speculate, intriguingly for our passage, that "among scholars, this may hint at plagiarism". Cf. also the πρόκυνες of *AP* 11.322.

79 Caston (2012) 9. Cf. Fantham (1986).

80 Fantham (1986) 53.

81 E.g., *spiritum Graiae tenuem Camenae / Parca non mendax dedit et malignum / spernere uolgus* ("a Fate which did not deceive granted a slender inspiration to my Greek Camena and to scorn the envious mob," Hor. *Carm.* 2.16.38–40), where *tenuis* renders λεπταλέος,

Thus we might gloss Martial as telling Mamurianus not to make the hackneyed Callimachean move of complaining that any criticism of them or their poetry is the result of φθόνος.

We might finally wonder whether 1.92 includes any allusion to the Telchines, who are such important figures in the *Aetia* prologue. Although it is Cestos who "often complains to me" like the Telchines in Callimachus, and it is Martial himself who is the epigram's critic of Callimachean aesthetics, nevertheless it is in Mamurianus, as the poet's antagonist, that we should look for associations with the Callimachus' antagonist. Although there is an element of paradox in this, we have already seen how, in *AP* 11.321 the Καλλιμάχου στρατιῶται are also Τελχίνες βίβλων. Among the surprisingly few references to the Telchines in Latin poetry, the most significant are in Martial's contemporary, Statius.[82] Both *Thebaid* 2.273–276, where they help Vulcan and the Cyclopes forge Harmonia's necklace, and *Siluae* 4.6.47–49, where the work of the same set of smiths is surpassed by Vindex's *Hercules Epitrapezios*, emphasize, in addition to their obvious but implicit connection with Callimachean poetics, the Telchines' role as metalworkers rather than magicians.[83] Incidentally, this emphasis might tend to privilege their depiction as poets (forging artifacts) over that as critics (casting invidious spells on others' creations). Since there is no explicit reference to the Telchines in Mart. 1.92, the Statian parallels might encourage us to look for more subtle allusions through references to metalworking and their fellow smiths, Vulcan and the Cyclopes. Mamurianus has one eye (*qui superest oculum*, 12), and while this hardly singles him out from the numerous *lusci* in the epigrams, the fact that Martial threatens to gouge it out (*fodiam digito*) sets the pair up as a low-life Polyphemus and Ulysses, and thus Mamurianus as a metalworking Cyclops.[84] Cestos' name, as commentators note, suggests

---

and *malignum uolgus* combines the φθόνος of Callim. *H.* 2.108–112 with τὰ δημόσια of *Epigr.* 27.4. See Santirocco (1986) 103. *inuidia*: e.g., Virg. *G.* 3.37; *liuor*: e.g., Ov. *Am.* 1.15.1 (cf. Mart. 11.33.3).

82 The only other occurrence of the name in Latin before Servius is at Ov. *Met.* 7.365, where it has a Callimachean significance (see Pavlock [2009] 59), but no reference to metalworking.

83 On these passages, see esp. McNelis (2007) 68–75 and (2008) 259–260; Chinn (2011) and (2013).

84 Thanks to Paul Roche for this suggestion. The conflation of Homer's pastoral and Hesiod's industrial Cyclopes is an easy one and, though rarely if ever explicit, seems to be assumed in, for instance, the use by Virgil of the phrase *Aetnaei Cylopes* to refer to both (*Aen.* 8.440, 11.263). On *lusci* in Martial, see P.A. Watson (1982). This reading does not of course exclude the attractive suggestion of O'Connor (1990), accepted by Obermayer (1998) 197, that the eye-gouging represents castration.

Aphrodite's "embroidered girdle" (κεστὸν ἱμάντα) at *Iliad* 14.214, which both suits his own metapoetic status as a highly-wrought work of art which provokes desire, and perhaps suggests a connection with Hephaestus/Vulcan, who crafted the girdle for his wife.[85] One might even wonder whether the repeated references to the "finger" (*digito*, Mart. 1.92.2, 3, 12) in the poem might evoke, through a bilingual pun on δάκτυλος, the Idaean Dactyls, those other monstrous metalworkers whom Strabo says are often conflated with the Telchines.[86] Further associations with metalwork can be found in the unusual name of the addressee.

The name Mamurianus is not found elsewhere in extant literary Latin, though it does occur (as has not to my knowledge been noted) in an epitaph from Euboea set up by an imperial freedman, Hymenaeus Mamurianus.[87] It bears a clear resemblance to Catullus' frequent addressee Mamurra, and could even be taken as a pseudo-adjectival formation from it, "like Mamurra." On one level, this evocation could serve simply to signal an allusion to Catullan poetry in general, even though 1.92's primary intertexts deal with Furius and Aurelius rather than Mamurra, but Martial's use of Catullan names often has a more specific, if unexpected, intertextual engagement with their original contexts.[88] It is notable that a Mamurra is the addressee of 10.4 with its Callimachean rejection of Callimachean themes, and this may partially evoke Catullus 105, where Mamurra (as Mentula) is depicted as a failed poet driven from the Pipleian mount by the Muses.[89] However, to return to Mamurianus' association with the Telchines, two further resonances of his name are possible. Catullus' Mamurra was also Caesar's *praefectus fabrum* and as such could be figured as a metalworker like the Telchines.[90] However, the formation Mamurianus could also suggest, not just "of Mamurra" but "of Mamurius." The legendary Veturius Mamurius was the

[85] I owe this idea to Marco Fucecchi. That Hephaestus made the κεστός is not explicit in the *Iliad*, but an obvious assumption (note esp. the parallels with his fashioning of Pandora in Hesiod and other magical creations, with Faraone [1990]). It is (all-but) explicit at Stat. *Theb.* 2.283–284. For a different wordplay, linking *Cestos* and *castus*, see Obermayer (1998) 54–55 and 197.

[86] Strab. 10.3.7, with Chinn (2011), esp. 86–87 on Statius' possible conflation of them at *Silu.* 4.6.47–49.

[87] Published as both *CIL* 3.563 and *CIL* 3.12289.

[88] See esp. L.C. Watson (2003) 8 for examples of each: "'Catulla' (the addressee of 8.54, a hendecasyllabic quatrain which is a tissue of Catullan reminiscences)" and Fabullus in 4.87 (see n.38 above).

[89] I am indebted to Aleksandra Kleczar for suggesting the connection with Catullus 105.

[90] Thanks to Kathryn Welch for this suggestion. On the duties of the *praefectus fabrum*, see Welch (1995).

smith who, in the reign of Numa, forged the replica *ancilia* to conceal and protect the heaven-sent *ancile* which was one of Rome's *pignora imperii*.[91] The allusions are subtle—and it may even be that they are too subtle—but it is possible to link Mamurianus' name with smithery and hence with Callimachus' Telchines.

4. *But is Martial's Catullus' Callimachus Catullus' Callimachus?*

Having established that there is a network of allusions to Callimachean aesthetics in Martial's 1.92, that a number of these are shared with Catullus' Furius and Aurelius cycle, and that the technique of exploiting this imagery to attack Callimachean poets and critics has parallels in Greek epigram, there remains a substantial question. We must ask ourselves whether Catullus, translator of the *Coma Berenices* and poet who shows his affiliation with the Callimachean aesthetic in countless other explicit and implicit ways, indeed who applies to himself the Callimachean imagery of dryness in poem 1 and of poverty in 13, would really have produced such an attack on that very aesthetic, or even whether Martial would have thought he had. Three solutions to this problem are possible and, although they are in the strictest sense mutually exclusive, in the fluid world of multiple intertexts and tendentious literary histories, we might allow them an uneasy coexistence.

The first is also the last of our earlier scenarios for understanding "Martial's Catullus," that this is not a learned interpretation aimed at illuminating the source text, but rather a self-conscious distortion of it. Such a reading would allow us to retain a consistently Callimachean Catullus and would be consistent with Martial's operation elsewhere, as, for example, in his invention of the "fiction" of Maecenas' patronage of Domitius Marsus, because his "poetry gained prestige by the suggestion that such a relationship had existed."[92] Considering the ambivalent attitude towards Callimacheanism which we have seen in Martial's epigrams, it would by no means be inconceivable that he would tendentiously rewrite the Furius and Aurelius cycle as an anti-Callimachean invective, retrospectively enrolling as an ally the improbable figure of *tenuis Catullus*. Such a reading would

---

[91] Ov. *Fast.* 3.260–392 (master "of the smith's art" [*fabrae ... artis*] at 383); Plut. *Num.* 13.3: "one of the foremost craftsmen"; also *opifex* at SHA *Tyr. Trig.* 8.3 and *faber* at Serv. ad *Aen.* 2.166 (where a doublet version is given about multiple Palladia), 7.188, and 8.664. Mamurius' name was preserved in (or derived from) the chant of the Salii, *mamuri ueturi* (Var. *L.* 6.49).

[92] 8.55[56].21–24, with Byrne (2004), quoting from 265.

show how Martial could manipulate (and in this case even fabricate elements of) Catullus' reception of Callimachus, but it would not tell us much about his reception of that reception, his glance through the Veronese window towards Alexandria. Rather than abandon entirely the possibility of such a window allusion, let us look at the possibilities which enable us to retain Martial as a (sometime) commentator rather than perverter of Catullus.

We might argue that Furius and Aurelius are attacked, not as Callimacheans *tout court*, but as extreme or perverted Callimacheans. In support of this scenario, we might think of the relationship between Pseudo-Demetrius' χαρακτὴρ ἰσχνός and its "adjacent fault" the χαρακτὴρ ξηρός, and wonder whether the "good" dryness of Catullus' pumice in poem 1 is similarly contrasted with the excessive dryness of Furius in 23, and thus that Callimacheanism itself is not attacked, only the extreme and over-pedantic following of its tenets. If there remains a degree of inconsistency in the position which the Catullan persona would be adopting in this scenario, the pot calling the kettle black, then that would not be unusual in the corpus, and indeed would be a potential failing which he himself draws attention to at the close of 22, as none of us sees the swag on our own back. Such a reading would be consistent both with Catullus' professed Callimacheanism elsewhere in the corpus and indeed with his own inconsistency, and thus be plausible enough, if not necessarily to win universal credence, at least to be the sort of interpretation which Martial could feasibly have believed and produced.

The final alternative, and perhaps the most attractive one, lies in David Wray's argument for Catullus' alternative—and opposed—"code models," the Archilochean and the Callimachean, corresponding to modes of the "poetic performance of manhood":

> … an Archilochian mode, characterized by aggressively hypermasculine invective … and a Callimachean mode, standing—or appearing to—at the antipodes of the Archilochian, fragrant with the sophistication of erudition and with the manhood of a "feminine" delicacy.[93]

The opposition between Archilochus and Callimachus as code models derives in large part from the well-established poetic antagonism between "wine-drinkers" and "water drinkers," most clearly expressed in an epigram by Antipater (*AP* 11.20) which dismisses the water-drinkers with their

93 Wray (2001) 167–203, quoting from 167.

pedantry and obscure diction from a symposium in honor of Archilochus and Homer.[94] Wray notes (170–171) how Catullus' exploitation of this imagery in 27 signals a move into "a recognizably Archilochian mode" in the following two poems, but his discussion goes on to include a scattered range of the polymetrics, including 16 from the Furius and Aurelius cycle (185–186). The hypermasculine, obscene invective of 15, 21, 23, and 24 could easily earn them a place among poems in the Archilochean mode, and this would be particularly pointed if the attack were on Furius and Aurelius as water-drinking Callimacheans. Read thus, Martial's creative interpretation of Catullus as an anti-Callimachean in the cycle seems not only less improbable, but positively persuasive. Moreover, the gendering of the Archilochus / Callimachus antithesis ("the division of male poets into wine-guzzling he-men … and water-sipping nellies," Wray [2001] 169) means that Martial's anti-Callimachean reading of the cycle does not reduce it to nothing but poetry about poetry. Rather, in the finest tradition of Callimachean poetic imagery and its reception, Furius', Aurelius', and Mamurianus' Callimacheanism is not simply troped by their depiction as potential *erastai* of Juventius and Cestos, but simultaneously tropes their gendered, social and sexual status as constructed by Catullus and Martial. As "water-sipping nellies," desiccated, emaciated and impoverished, they are as unfit to be masculine penetrators of an *eromenos* as they are to write poetry which is anything other than effete, dry, jejune, and destitute of ideas. Such a reading might even forge a link with the more overt parallelism of sex and poetry in 16, where Catullus denies the charge of (water-drinking?) effeminacy by casting his critics, the same Furius and Aurelius, in that pathic role instead, and (despite his insistence on the disjuncture between poetry and life) adopts the (wine-drinking?) hypermasculine persona of the *pedicator*, enacting that invasive violence by the perlocutionary force of his poetic invective. Creative commentary often simplifies its model, privileging one facet of a complex source text at the expense of all others. In the case of 1.92, however, Martial imitates and annotates not merely Catullus' engagement with Callimachean imagery in the Furius and Aurelius cycle, but the full complexity with which the Neoteric received and imitated Callimachus' own subtle technique of interplay between poetic metaphor and socio-sexual reality.

94 On wine- and water-drinkers, see esp. Crowther (1979); Knox (1985); and Wray (2001) 169–176. Considering Furius' and Mamurianus' dryness, it is intriguing that *siccus* in its related sense of "teetotal" (*OLD* s.v. 7) is used of "water-drinkers" at Hor. *Epist.* 1.19.8. However, the emphasis on their drinking of water (Horace even sends them to the Libo's well!) makes any connection with dehydration difficult.

INHERITING SPEECH: TALKING BOOKS COME TO FLAVIAN ROME*

Ana Maria Lóio

Martial reworks the Hellenistic tradition of writing epigrams on poets, in its several types, celebrating himself as well as others.[1] Indeed the epigrammatist produces his own epitaph, which is to be inscribed on his own statue in Avitus' library (Mart. 9 *praef*. 5–9); 1.1 is a self-homage, which some have thought destined to accompany his portrait; a distich on Virgil, one in a series of "tags" for books (14.183–196), would seem to fulfill the same function (14.186); Silius and Lucan are also among those commended (7.63, 11.48; 7.21–23).[2] Further, Martial experimented with the rare type of epigrams spoken by a book:[3] for instance, the Greek *Batrachomachia*[4] has something to say about itself—in Latin!—(14.183), and the tenth book anticipates (possible) problems of weight before the reader even starts reading it (10.1). In this study I would like to focus on the poet's fresh and bold reenactment of such a peculiar tradition.

The practice of allowing objects to speak has a considerable relevance in the *Xenia* and the *Apophoreta*.[5] It is true that uncommon voices in these books are a manifestation of the *mundus inuersus* and a deviation from the

---

* I am most grateful to Paolo Fedeli, Joy Littlewood, Cristina Pimentel, Stefano Grazzini, David Paniagua, Darcy Krasne, Fotini Hadjittofi, and Barry Taylor for their kind reading and suggestions.

1 On the Greek tradition of writing epigrams on poets, see Gabathuler (1937); Bing (1988a) 29–53, 58–64, (1988b), and (1993); Rossi (2001) 81–106. A typology is proposed by Gabathuler (1937) 107–111 and discussed by Rossi (2001) 85–86.

2 See Citroni (1975) 14–15 and Henriksén (2012) 2, 9–10 on Martial's epigrams on himself; on the portrait tradition, see Lausberg (1982) 562 n. 7; for the other epigrams, see the commentary and bibliography in Leary (1996) 251; Galán Vioque (2002) 168–179, 364–371; Kay (1985) 173–175.

3 The small corpus was identified by McKeown (1989) 1–2.

4 Shackleton Bailey's edition reads *Batrachomyomachia*, but I adopt, with Leary, the reading *Batrachomachia*. Leary (1996) 26, 247–248 is right in emphasizing that the title of the poem survives in Latin only in Martial 14.183 and in Statius *Silu*. 1 *praef*. 7–8, and in both cases there is no manuscript support for reading *Batrachomyomachia*.

5 In the *Xenia*, eighteen out of 124 epigrams are spoken by the objects (14.5 %), and the same happens in fifty-five out of 221 epigrams in the *Apophoreta* (25 %).

natural order of things.[6] At least some of Martial's talking objects push the limits of this tradition, however, inviting comparison with certain epigrammatic pieces by Callimachus and some of his contemporaries.[7] These poets bring out primordial conventions of epigram, namely the objects' ability to speak and possess cognition, commenting on their own dedication or on their former and current "lives."[8] The best known "speakers" are probably Callimachus' bronze rooster (*Ep.* 56 Pfeiffer), which confesses not to be in a position to assert what it says about its own dedication; a learned shell, competent in natural history (*Ep.* 5 Pfeiffer); or the bored mask of Dionysus, tired of hearing schoolboys repeat one of his lines (*Ep.* 26 Pfeiffer). Similarly, Martial's talking objects have a considerable range of expertise. Some consider linguistic issues related to themselves. A dead flamingo with no tongue explains the origin of its name (Mart. 13.71); a *lucerna polymyxos* and a piece of *lana amethystina* have a word to say about the appropriateness of their designation (14.41, 14.154); pronouncing its name in Latin and Greek, the *aphonitrum* attests to the fact that some objects can even be bilingual (14.58).[9] A pheasant exhibits still other qualities, posing as an erudite biographer (13.72).

From the above, it could be assumed that the speaking *Batrachomachia* and 10.1 are by no means random voice variations. In my opinion, epigrams spoken by the book are attractive choices for Martial for specific reasons. The poet is particularly interested in the polemical attitude that characterizes the speaking book tradition since its earliest proponents. It will suffice to recall the controversial epigram by Asclepiades on Antimachus' *Lyde* (*AP* 9.63), to which Callimachus most probably replied, also in an epigram (fr. 398 Pfeiffer), scorning both Asclepiades' homage and Antimachus' poem; later, Callimachus' reply will have brought about a retort from Antipater of Sidon, who takes over Antimachus' defense (*AP* 7.490).[10] Moreover, I think the possibility should not be ruled out that Martial finds interest in the language of epigrams on poets, which explores the semantics of size and value:

---

6 Grewing (1999) 261.

7 On Martial and Callimachus, see Cowan and Neger extensively in this volume, pp. 327–344 and 345–371.

8 This extends to the corpses' "habit" of talking. Tueller (2008) discusses the role of voice in epigrammatic poetry; see also Bettenworth (2007) and Meyer (2007).

9 See Grewing (1999) 266–269. Among the issues discussed are dialectology and the quantity of vowels.

10 See Bing (1993) on the making of this tradition. On the examples given from the *Anthologia Palatina*, see Cameron (1995) 303–307, 319–320, 330–337, 486–487; Krevans (1993).

a poem or a book is big or the greatest (*AP* 9.25, Callimachus); one poet is greater than another (*AP* 7.18, Antipater of Sidon); an island or a city is too small for a given poet (*AP* 7.1, Alcaeus of Messene; *AP* 7.2, Antipater of Sidon, both on Homer; *AP* 7.19, Leonidas [of Tarentum?][11] on Alcman). It is generally recognized that Martial is captivated by the relationship between literature and its materiality, namely in his approach to the criteria according to which literature is to be judged.[12] In the traditional hierarchy of genres, "epic" implies long size and reigns supreme, even if it is bad, while "brief" means "insignificant," which is the case of epigram, even if not every poet has what it takes to write it—as is manifest, for example, in Gaurus' conviction that the measure of one's intelligence is proportionate to the length of one's poetry:[13]

> Ingenium mihi, Gaure, probas sic esse pusillum,
> carmina quod faciam quae breuitate placent.
> confiteor. sed tu bis senis grandia libris
> qui scribis Priami proelia, magnus homo es?
> nos facimus Bruti puerum, nos Langona uiuum:
> tu magnus luteum, Gaure, Giganta facis. (Mart. 9.50)

> You argue that my talent is inconsiderable, Gaurus, because I make poems that please by brevity. I confess it. But you that write of Priam's mighty battles in twice six books, are you a great man? I make a live Brutus' Boy, a live Langon: you, Gaurus, great man that you are, make a giant of clay.

This criterion is contradicted by Tucca's ability to surpass Martial, in all genres except in epigram (12.94.10), and by the poet's subtle self-homage in 4.23, hinting that he cannot be rivaled and that he is on a par with Callimachus:[14]

> Dum tu lenta nimis diuque quaeris
> quis primus tibi quisue sit secundus
> Graium quos epigramma comparauit,
> palmam Callimachus, Thalia, de se
> facundo dedit ipse Bruttiano.
> qui si Cecropio satur lepore

---

11 See Gow and Page (1965) 2.308–309 on the question of authorship.

12 Roman (2001), esp. 118–119, 123, 138, 145.

13 See Mart. 9.50 with Williams (2008) 223–226 and Henriksén (2012) 217–220. See also Mart. 9.43–44 with McNelis (2008); Schneider (2001); and Canobbio (2008) 187–189.

14 Moreno Soldevila (2006) 227. See Citroni (2006) on the generic system in the Flavian age. Compare Mart. 12.94 with the generic hierarchy expounded in Tac. *Dial.* 10.4; see also Pliny's apology for writing epigram (Plin. *Ep.* 5.3.2–3) and Mart. 4.49.1–2 with Moreno Soldevila (2006) 356–363.

Romanae sale luserit Mineruae,
illi me facias precor secundum. (Mart. 4.23)

As you, Thalia, investigate too leisurely and too long which of the Greeks whom epigram has set in competition you should put in first place and which in second, Callimachus himself conceded the palm to eloquent Bruttianus. If, replete with Attic wit, he toys with the salt of Roman Minerva, I beg you make me second to him.

I think both talking books can be seen to further one of Martial's main objectives, namely to deconstruct such a hierarchy,[15] proving it inadequate and putting forward a different view.

So Martial's books have some battles to fight. At first, it will seem that the problems a good book has to face under the Flavians are not so different from those it had to confront at the beginning of the Hellenistic age. Yet the reader is left with more questions than answers: Martial appears to be working in the Hellenistic tradition, but it is difficult to assert his debt to particular poems.

1. *Celebrating Homer … As Always?*

Critics almost unanimously adopt the view that Martial himself is the speaker of 14.183 (even though as such it would not fulfill the function for which it was created, that is, to accompany the gift announced in the *lemma*);[16] Leary alone considers that voice is given to the pseudo-Homeric epic,[17] which is the possibility I would like to explore. In my opinion, Martial's *Batrachomachia* is unique in that it is the only bilingual book in the tradition of epigrams on poets, and I show how significant that might be. Another issue must be taken into account when addressing the tradition behind this epigram. If it is accepted that Archelaus' relief on the apotheosis of Homer does not allude to the *Batrachomachia*,[18] then Martial's epigram is the oldest reference to the poem, followed closely by that of Statius (*Silu.* 1 *praef.* 7–8).[19]

15 This objective has been recognized and commented upon by Sullivan (1987) and (1991) 58, 62–63, 95, 97, 102, 218.

16 Pini (2006) 476 calls attention to this aspect; for bibliography, see 476 n. 2.

17 Leary (1996) 248.

18 This proposal has been generally accepted. Wölke (1978) 64–68 summarizes the story of the monument's interpretation; see also West (1969) 123 n. 35.

19 Stat. *Silu.* 1 *praef.* 7–9: *sed et Culicem legimus et Batrachomachiam etiam agnoscimus, nec quisquam est inlustrium poetarum qui non aliquid operibus suis stilo remissiore praeluserit* ("But we read *The Gnat* and even recognize *The Battle of the Frogs and Mice*; and none of our

These *loci* would attest to the poem's circulation under the name of Homer by Domitian's time;[20] what is more, they would bear witness to Martial's and Statius' acceptance of its Homeric authorship.[21] Nevertheless, I find it highly doubtful that these poets could have been unfamiliar with the polemics surrounding the assignment of a number of works to Homer, a topic much debated for centuries in Homeric scholarship.[22] I think the question should be left open whether Martial and Statius subscribe to this, especially since, in both cases, a programmatic statement is at stake.

There is no novelty in an epigram celebrating the most renowned of poets,[23] but it is surely peculiar to choose to commemorate the greatest of poets in the lowest of genres. Indeed Martial may have found his only precedent in Callimachus. The Greek poet had already sung of one, possibly two pseudo-Homeric poems: some sources attest to an epigram in which the *Margites* is attributed to Homer and enjoyed Callimachus' admiration (such statements invite an extremely cautious approach);[24] what is more, the one Callimachean epigram we possess on a pseudo-Homeric poem, the *Oichalias Halosis*, is spoken by the book (Callim. *Ep*. 6 Pfeiffer). So Martial is not an innovator in singing of a minor work circulating under Homer's name. And yet, even if Callimachus is somehow relevant to Martial's talking book, the Flavian poet goes beyond his predecessor. The epigram furthers an ambitious poetic agenda, and, in my opinion, in a particularly original way:

> Homeri Batrachomachia
> Perlege Maeonio cantatas carmine ranas
> et frontem nugis soluere disce meis. (Mart. 14.183)

> Homer's *Battle of the Frogs and Mice*
> Read through the frogs sung in Maeonian song and learn to relax your brow with my trifles.

---

illustrious poets but has preluded his works with something in lighter vein."). See Easterling and Knox (1985) 39 and West (2003) 229.

20 Wölke (1978) 68; West (2003) 235.

21 Leary (1996) 247–248 does not discuss the point, whereas Vollmer (1898) 211 stresses the accepting tone of Statius' remark.

22 See the remarks by Wölke (1978) 69.

23 Skiadas (1965) is entirely devoted to the celebration of Homer in Greek epigram.

24 Harpocration, a second century CE Alexandrian grammarian, s.v. Μαργίτης; Eustratius ad Arist. *Eth. Nic*. 6.7.2. See Bossi (1986) 45 n. 4; Gabathuler (1937) 13; Cessi (1907) 5–43. On the poem *Margites*, see Glei (1999) with bibliography. Bossi (1986) 7 goes too far in concluding from the testimony that Callimachus actually admired the *Margites*; Pfeiffer (1949–1953) 1.325 draws attention to the final verb, ἔοικεν ("he seems to").

In my opinion, despite the *lemma*, Martial creates the illusion that we are reading an epigram about the Homeric epics: these, and not the 300-verse mock-epic, would be the poems a bad reader needs to be encouraged to read until the end, *perlegere*. Furthermore, *Maeonium ... carmen* is a classic periphrasis, for instance in Horace and Ovid,[25] for the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Consequently, only the last word of the hexameter, *ranas*, destroys the illusion that this is an epigram about the best of Homer.

The second line poses the problem of the speaker's identity. The book tells the readers of the relaxed attitude they will experience. Elsewhere, Martial depicts in a similar way his reader's relaxation while enjoying his epigrams (4.14) and recommends them to Pliny as "light reading" to be savored at a particular time of day (10.20).[26] With regard to *nugis ... meis*, Martial frequently employs this expression when discussing his own writings[27] (therefore, this epigram has been taken to be spoken by Martial, who thus refers in the first person to his trifles).

Of course Martial intends to stress the similarities between what he chooses to write and what Homer allegedly wrote. But there is more to it. If the *Batrachomachia* is the speaker, the book's self-depiction as *nugae* places it at the bottom of the traditional hierarchy of genres, alongside Martial's own epigrams. Homer would thus become the first writer of *nugae*; we discover that this practice goes back to the beginning of Greek literature and to its greatest poet, who thus becomes Martial's predecessor. Martial reinterprets literary history in order to ennoble epigram. His epigrams would be seen to continue a less valued branch of Homeric poetry, light and playful, but nonetheless worthy of the greatest of poets. In addition, as mentioned above, we are frequently told that others can be brilliant in their genres, but not in Martial's; he is without doubt the "Homer of epigram," a poet whose expertise in his genre cannot be surpassed.

Other instances in which Martial attempts to ennoble the genre of epigram can be related to the *Batrachomachia*'s speech. The tablets of citrus-wood, the first in a series of writing materials, are allowed to speak as well:

---

25 According to Galán Vioque (2002) 289–290, the periphrasis becomes usual in Greek poetry from the second century BCE; e.g., Antipater of Sidon (*AP* 7.2.1–2), Aceratus (*AP* 7.138.3). First occurrences in Latin poetry: *Ciris* 62; Hor. *Carm*. 1.6.2, 4.9.5; Prop. 2.28.29. It is particularly frequent in Ovid (*Rem*. 373, *Ars* 2.4, *Pont*. 3.3.31).

26 Cf. also Mart. 4.8.7–12, 7.26.5, 10.64.2; Stat. *Silu*. 1.3.91–92, 2.6.65–66; Sil. 2.414, 3.298; Apul. *Met*. 9.27.20–21.

27 E.g., Mart. 1.113.6, 2.1.6, 4.10.4, 5.80.3, 6.64.7–8, 7.11.4, 9 *praef*. 5, 10.18.4, 13.2.4.

Pugillares citrei
Secta nisi in tenues essemus ligna tabellas,
essemus Libyci nobile dentis onus. (Mart. 14.3)

Tablets of citrus wood
If we had not been cut into thin tablets, we should be the noble burden of a Libyan tusk.

The tablets present themselves as an object made of a very expensive wood, but not very durable in that specific format. The wood they are made of could make an exquisite table with ivory legs. They are indeed an extravagance, but in my opinion such extravagance has a literary meaning as well. The wood is used as raw material for very perishable and valueless objects, the writing tablets, when it could be used to build an expensive and valuable object, an exquisite table. The same is applied to poetry. Raw material does not distinguish noble poetry from playful trifles. To prove it, many epigrams on *sigillaria* (14.170–182), the section that precedes the book list in the *Apophoreta*, treat epic material. In fact, Stephen Hinds has convincingly demonstrated that the *Metamorphoses* and the *Aeneid* are the intertext of several epigrams in this series;[28] in addition, in the series devoted to *sigillaria*, Martial explores epic episodes where he finds some trace of an epigrammatic commemoration, seen to anticipate his literary project in the *Apophoreta*. Hinds describes it as "an extraction of epigrams" from epic poems and calls the phenomenon "epigrammatic distillation."[29] Accordingly, the raw material that Martial turns into epigram is apt for epic poetry. He chooses to apply it, nonetheless, to the lowest of genres, and opts provocatively for the minimal form, the monodistich. Hence there is no point in insisting that subject matter is a criterion for distinguishing elevated, long poems from occasional, small trifles. Martial shows that such an approach is unsustainable.

I think another ennobling strategy explains, at least partially, the distribution of the books into cheap and expensive gifts:

---

[28] Hinds (2007) 139–146 speaks of an "aesthetic negotiation" (141) with the *Metamorphoses* in Mart. 14.173 (*Hyacinthus in tabula pictus*), 14.174 (*Hermaphroditus marmoreus*), 14.180 (*Europe picta*). The *Aeneid* is recalled à propos of 14.178 (*Hercules fictilis*).

[29] Hinds (2007) 143.

	EXPENSIVE GIFTS	CHEAP GIFTS
Mart. 14.183–196	183 Homer, *Batrachomachia*	184 Homer, *Iliad* and *Odyssey*
	185 Virgil, *Culex*	186 Virgil, *Aeneid*
	187 Menander, *Thais*	188 Cicero
	189 Propertius, *Monobyblos*	190 Livy
	191 Sallust	192 Ovid, *Metamorphoses*
	193 Tibullus	194 Lucan
	195 Catullus	196 Calvus?

Several attempts have been made to explain the distribution of literary works into sequences of poor and expensive gifts, but no attempt successfully accounts for the whole list. Critics have gone so far as to suppose *lacunae* in order to explain the failure to reach a conclusion.[30] In what concerns the location of the *Batrachomachia* at the head of the book-series and as an expensive gift, some readers find it odd that it has been given such honor, particularly when the Homeric epics come next; it has been proposed that such an "oddity" is due to an accidental inversion of the order of epigrams 183 and 184.[31] Physical impossibilities, however, like a one-volume Livy, suggest that Martial is playing an ambitious game:

> Titus Livius in membranis
> Pellibus exiguis artatur Livius ingens,
> quem mea non totum bibliotheca capit. (Mart. 14.190)

> Titus Livius on parchment
> Vast Livy, for whom complete my library does not have room, is compressed in tiny skins.

The poet is not interested in the relationship between the books as he depicts them and any real object.[32] In my opinion, the tradition of writing epigrams on poets has also undergone an "epigrammatic distillation": it exhibits the minimal form, and its eulogistic language has been "filtered"; it only matters what one can measure, count and weigh. Accordingly, the cheap gifts are all lengthy works: the epics (Homer, Virgil, Ovid, Lucan) and prose writers who are known for having written at length (Cicero, Livy); whether to read Calvus or Calidus remains uncertain, as also their literary

30 On this issue, Pini (2006). See also Birt (1882) 71–87; Friedrich (1907) 373–374; Roberts and Skeat (1983) 26–28; Leary (1996) 13–21; Muñoz Jiménez (1996).

31 See Pini (2006).

32 Roman (2001) 134–136. On Mart. 14.190, see Friedländer (1886) 2.338; Butrica (1983); Sansone (1980–1981).

output. By contrast, the expensive gifts are those which are usually referred to as *lusus*: Homer and Virgil's minor works; Menander, whom the Romans considered a love poet; the elegists; of course Catullus, the master of *nugae*; and finally Sallust, whose work is miniature when compared to Livy's—but even so he is "the first among historians." Hence, in Martial's world and in defense of his aesthetic inclination, the lighter literary works are more valuable than the weightier. Bigger does not mean better. This, in the end, is what Martial means to stress, in defense of his aesthetic decision to cultivate the lightest of forms. Furthermore, as I have advanced above, some poems of the *Apophoreta* may show the poet stressing the need to review the criteria according to which literature should be evaluated. Therefore, small, insignificant objects are seen to start thematic sequences in the *Apophoreta*, like the *Batrachomachia* and the writing tablets of citrus wood. This is also why, against what one might expect, briefer literary works and those said to be *lusus*, like epigram, are the expensive ones. Epigram has its worth; small can be equally as noble and equally as good.

2. *Too Good For You*

Martial's tenth book bears a close relationship to the preface of Ovid's *Amores*, as has been recognized:[33]

> Si nimius uideor seraque coronide longus
> esse liber, legito pauca: libellus ero.
> terque quaterque mihi finitur carmine paruo[34]
> pagina: fac tibi me quam cupis ipse breuem. (Mart. 10.1)

> If I seem too large and long a book with colophon that comes too late, read a few items only: I shall then be a little book. My pages quite often end with the end of a little poem. Make me as brief for yourself as you like.

[33] Lorenz (2002) 221 n. 49. McKeown (1989) 2–3 enrolls Mart. 10.1 in the corpus of the epigrams spoken by the book; Morena Soldevila (2006) 516 relates Ovid's epigram to Mart. 4.82; Roman (2001) 136 associates it to Mart. 14.2.

[34] I do not agree with the reading *parua / pagina*, advanced by Immisch (1911) 514 and adopted by Shackleton Bailey. In my opinion, the idea that the page is (already) small does not conform to Martial's intents. First, it is the reader who is (supposedly) to turn the book into a small work, if he wishes to; according to this point of view, the book should appear not to be physically defined until the reader does so; Martial is precisely offering him the opportunity. Therefore, I find the *iunctura carmine paruo* much more probable: it alludes to the genre of the whole book, by reference to its defining shortness and lightness.

Qui modo Nasonis fueramus quinque libelli,
tres sumus; hoc illi praetulit auctor opus.
ut iam nulla tibi nos sit legisse uoluptas,
at leuior demptis poena duobus erit. (Ov. *Am. praef.*)

We who erewhile were five booklets of Naso now are three; the poet has preferred to have his work thus rather than as before. Though even now you may take no joy of reading us, yet with two books taken away your pains will be lighter.

Ovid's *Amores* and Martial's book 10 are joined by the much discussed connection that they are said to be "second versions" or, as it is usually expressed, "second editions." Moreover, both books address the issue of length and relate it to the reader's liking, and in both cases it is implied that the reader's aesthetic criteria are doubtful; in addition, the book's transformation is at stake in both epigrams. But although Martial's preface is indebted to Ovid's, the books tell a quite different story. This debt should not determine the approach to the poem's place in the tradition of epigrams on poets, lest it blur the need to investigate its direct links with tradition. As regards the tortuous question of the "second edition," one should keep in mind, for the purpose of the present discussion,[35] that it is announced by Ovid, but not by Martial. Martial postpones this information until the second epigram, suppressing it from the book's speech and turning it into one of the poet's commentaries on the book:[36]

[35] There are two main ways of approaching the problem of Ovid's and Martial's "second edition." Some take the books' words literally, accepting that both were "reworked," therefore trying to explain the poets' motivations and speculating on the changes which the books underwent. On Ovid, see Müller (1856) 81; Reitzenstein (1935); Oliver (1945); D'Elia (1958); Luck (1961); Giomini (1959); Lenz (1965) 164; Cameron (1968) 320–322, 328–330 and (1995) 156–160; Martini (1970) 14; Jacobson (1974) 301; Sabot (1976); Murgia (1986); Della Corte (1986) 70; McKeown (1987) 74–89. On Martial, see Friedländer (1886) 2.108; Sullivan (1991) 44 and 52; Pitcher (1998) 70–71; Fearnley (2003) 617; Damschen and Heil (2004) 3–8; Moreno Soldevila (2004–2005) xvii n. 46; Fitzgerald (2007) 160–162. Others consider that the "second edition" should be interpreted as "metapoetic play" or as a façade. On Ovid, see Barchiesi (2001) 159–161; Boyd (1997) 142–147 and (2002) 110–113; Bretzigheimer (2001) 91–94; Holzberg (2002c) 31–34 and (2006) 58–60. On Martial, see Holzberg (2004–2005) 213–219. For a more sceptical approach to Martial's motivations both for returning to Spain and for reworking book 10, see Syme (1958) 1.86–92; Coleman (1993); Howell (1998) 184–185; Holzberg (2002b) 140–148; Howell (2009) 67–70. More generally, see Fowler (1995) on reading Martial's comments as "generic pretence."

[36] In my opinion, 10.1 and 10.2 form a pair, the allusion to Ovid's preface being one of the links between them.

Festinata prius, decimi mihi cura libelli
  elapsum manibus nunc reuocauit opus.
nota leges quaedam sed lima rasa recenti;
  pars noua maior erit: lector, utrique faue. (Mart. 10.2.1–4)

In composing my tenth little book, too hastily issued earlier, I have now recalled the work that then slipped from my hands. Some of the pieces you will read are already known, but polished with a recent file, the greater part will be new. Reader, wish well to both.

The author wishes to have nothing to do with the act of abridgement. On the contrary, it is Ovid who allegedly turns the *Amores* into a shorter work; as a consequence of the poet's decision, the reader will be relieved (*leuior … poena … erit*, Ov. *Am. praef.* 4). Martial, quite differently, has no intention of shortening his book, which he leaves up to his readers (Mart. 10.1.4). His task as an author is done. In Martial, the book's story appears to depend on the reader (*si nimius uideor … legito pauca*, 10.1.1–2; *fac tibi me …*, 4), whereas that of the *Amores* is the author's own responsibility (*hoc illi praetulit auctor opus*, Ov. *Am. praef.* 2). Furthermore, the *Amores* may be said to present a biographical account of itself. As noted above, this feature is very common in dedicatory epigrams, in some of which the dedicated object compares its former life to its ("new") existence as an *ex uoto*.[37] By contrast, Martial's book 10 focuses on the future, commenting on what it may become, if readers choose to shorten it. Besides, brevity seems to be far more relevant to Martial than to Ovid, and invites discussion on several levels: genre, book, poem, verse, and language. The poet emphasizes, in particular, the paradox of the *epigrammaton liber*, an *opus* showing the coherence of a poetry book, although formed by the accumulation of many small units;[38] closely related to this is the relevance of brevity in the definition of epigram.[39]

By comparing Ovid's and Martial's treatment of analogous topics, it becomes clear how original the latter's approach is. In fact, it is only when we go beyond the similarities between the speeches in the *Amores* and Martial's book 10 that the most interesting questions arise. I wish to suggest that these concern Martial's direct knowledge of the Greek tradition of writing epigrams on poets, in particular that of letting the book speak for itself.

---

37 The *Anthologia Palatina* preserves many epigrams spoken by votive objects, especially in book 6, devoted to dedicatory epigrams. See, e.g., *AP* 6.124, 125, and 127 (shields); 6.49 (a tripod), 107 (a spear), 113 (a horn), 148 (a lamp), 159 (a trumpet). On the subject see Tueller (2008).

38 Fitzgerald (2007) 2–3.

39 See Citroni (2003) and Canobbio (2008) 169–170 n. 2 with further bibliography.

In Hellenistic poetry, the speaking books introduce themselves. As part of the presentation they say who they are and identify their author. For example, in a famous epigram by Asclepiades, *Lyde* plays with its title: Λυδὴ καὶ γένος εἰμὶ καὶ οὔνομα· ("I am 'Lyde' in race and name"); it proclaims it is the joint work of the Muses and Antimachus (*AP* 9.63= 32 Sens); again, in the epigram by Callimachus mentioned above, Creophylus' *Oichalias Halosis* plays with authorial recognition and also says what it is about: κλείω δ' Εὔρυτον ὅσσ' ἔπαθεν, / καὶ ξανθὴν Ἰόλειαν ("My subject is Eurytos, his agonies, and blond Ioleia," Callim. 6.2–3 Pfeiffer).[40] Additionally, although the *Amores* do not announce its subject, it presents itself as the work of Ovid (*Nasonis*, 1). Surprisingly, we find nothing similar in Martial's preface. The book does not acknowledge its author and does not present or hint at its subject in any way. In fact, the tenth book says nothing about what it is; on the contrary, and against the speaking book tradition, it avoids defining itself. It is noticeable that it never says it is too long or too big but that it may seem so in the eyes of the reader. Furthermore, it does not comment on its size, but on the reader's judgment about its size. The only thing Martial reveals about the book is its willingness to be shortened at the reader's will.

The structure of the book's speech reflects the ideas it puts forward. The book's characterization literally depends upon the reader's view: *esse* depends on *uideor*, which is emphasized between two *caesurae*,[41] and this dependence takes place within a conditional clause. It is significant that the book is only allowed to be something in the future, when the reader has already made his judgment and acted upon it: at that time, it states, *libellus ero* (2). Also the *liber* turns into a *libellus* in the same verse, showing how quick its transformation can be, if the reader so desires. Moreover, the possibility that the book seems too long reveals itself in the structure of the couplet. *Nimius* (1) is expected to find a noun at the end of the hexameter; but in that position we notice another adjective pointing to excess, *longus*. Thus *liber* is postponed until the pentameter, therefore appearing ... "too late." The sentence is too long; it does not fit into the hexameter. In fact, one of its components, *seraque coronide*, is something that could be dispensed with. An enthusiast for conciseness could point out that it is not even necessary to the sentence's correctness, since it adds no new idea and the

[40] Cf. also the anonymous epigram spoken by Lycophron's *Alexandra* (*AP* 9.191), cited below; the charming collection of lyric poets to be offered to Antonia, which identifies itself as such in an epigram by Crinagoras (*AP* 9.239); the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*'s introduction in the first person in an epigram by Antiphilus of Byzantium (*AP* 9.192).

[41] See also Mart. 10.10.11.

belated appearance of the end is already implied in the excessive length of the book. Hence it is not only that the *coronis* might come too late—it is already delaying the poem's rhythm. It only makes the poem longer, causing us to wait a little more for the word *liber* and for the end of the first sentence. It is as if the word arrangement mirrored what the readers might think of the book: some pieces are dispensable, wasting our time. In the last verse, the book shows once again its ability to become shorter: its invitation to the reader (*fac tibi me quam cupis ipse breuem*, 4) occupies less than a pentameter and is expressed in short words, all of them mono- or bisyllabic, and none of them longer than one foot. Within the first epigram, words are already shorter; consequently, the reading has already become quicker.

Concerning the book's appearance, there is another point to be made. As is well known, the book's voice is indebted to an ancient epigrammatic tradition according to which the dedicated object speaks for itself. The epigrams would be inscribed on the object, which would be in the reader's hands or in the reader's sight. Martial might be playing with the ancestral relationship between inscribed epigram and inscribed object—a favorite issue for ancient epigrammatists[42]—since a literary epigram can be said to be inscribed on the book. This allows Martial to exploit the reader's reaction to the book's physical appearance. Yet *uideor* does not decide between physical and intellectual perception (*OLD* s.v. *uideo* 20 and 22). It is true that the readers are just beginning to read, so they could not yet have an opinion about the quality of the book.[43] But they do. In book 10, we are already acquainted with Martial's readers. They judge poetry "by the Persian chain" (Callim. *Aet.* fr. 1.18 Harder); an epigram of many verses will be skipped:

> conueniat nobis ut fas epigrammata longa
> sit transire tibi, scribere, Tucca, mihi. (Mart. 6.65.5–6)

> Let us make a bargain: it shall be your privilege to skip long epigrams and mine, Tucca, to write them.

> Consumpta est uno si lemmate pagina, transis,
> et breuiora tibi, non meliora placent. (Mart. 10.59.1–2)

> If a page is used up with a single title, you pass it by; you like the shorter items, not the better ones.

---

[42] Gutzwiller (1998) 7–9; Meyer (2007); Tueller (2008) 141–193. On Martial, see Fowler (1995) 53–56.

[43] Another argument would be that it is in fact already Martial's tenth book, not counting the *Liber spectaculorum*, the *Xenia*, and the *Apophoreta*.

Therefore, the idea that the book appears too big and too long can point both to the extravagant size of the collection and to poetry so bad that the book seems unending.[44] This is what Martial intended to stress concerning his readers: their appreciation of poetry does not distinguish between quality and quantity. Cosconius' attitude is paradigmatic:[45]

> Cosconi, qui longa putas epigrammata nostra,
>   utilis unguendis axibus esse potes.
> hac tu credideris longum ratione colosson
>   et puerum Bruti dixeris esse breuem.
> disce quod ignoras: Marsi doctique Pedonis
>   saepe duplex unum pagina tractat opus.
> non sunt longa quibus nihil est quod demere possis,
>   sed tu, Cosconi, disticha longa facis. (Mart. 2.77)

> Cosconius, you that think my epigrams too long, you would do fine for greasing axles. At that rate you would find the Colossus too tall and call Brutus' boy too short. Let me tell you what you do not know: two pages of Marsus and accomplished Pedo often cover a single item. Things from which you cannot make any deduction are not long. But you, Cosconius, make long couplets.

This agrees well with their supposed willingness to skip poems, ignoring that a poetry book depends on the articulation of all its pieces. Such criteria are crude and old-fashioned. In a word, Martial's readers are not ready for him.

It has been noted that the book's invitation intends to put off the bad reader,[46] whose profile the poet has been tracing since his first books. The epigrammatic reader evaluates poems and books by their length and loses interest very quickly, unless you present her or him with lasciviousness and obscenity:

> lectis uix tibi paginis duabus
> spectas eschatocollion, Seuere,
> et longas trahis oscitationes. (Mart. 2.6.2–4)

> You have hardly read a couple of pages, Severus, and you are looking at the final sheet and fetching lengthy yawns.

---

[44] Such play between the physical attributes of a book and the qualities of the poetry it encloses is far from being a novelty (cf., e.g., Catul. 1). Both interpretations have also been proposed for Callimachus' fr. 465 Pfeiffer; on Callimachean aesthetics, see Cowan in this volume, pp. 345–371.

[45] On Mart. 2.77 and 10.59, see Williams (2008); cf. also Lausberg (1982) 51.

[46] See in particular Henderson (2001) 81.

iam lector queriturque deficitque,
iam librarius hoc et ipse dicit
'ohe, iam satis est, ohe, libelle.' (Mart. 4.89.7–9)

Already the reader grows querulous and weary, already the very copyst says: "Whoa, there's enough, whoa now, little book!"

Huc est usque tibi scriptus, matrona, libellus.
cui sint scripta rogas interiora? mihi.
gymnasium, thermae, stadium est hac parte: recede.
exuimur: nudos parce uidere uiros …
si bene te noui, longum iam lassa libellum
ponebas, totum nunc studiosa leges. (Mart. 3.68.1–4, 11–12)

Thus far, matron, my little book has been written for you. For whom are the latter parts written, you ask? For me. The gymnasium, the warm baths, the running track are in this portion. Retire; we are undressing. Forbear to look upon naked males … If I know you well, you were already weary of the lengthy volume and putting it aside; but now you will read with interest to the end.

By offering the reader the possibility of skipping poems, as in epigram 10.1, Martial creates a defense strategy against bad readers:[47]

Quo uis cumque loco potes hunc finire libellum:
uersibus explicitum est omne duobus opus.
lemmata si quaeris cur sint ascripta, docebo:
ut, si malueris, lemmata sola legas. (Mart. 14.2)

You can finish this book at any place you choose. Every performance is completed in two lines. If you ask why headings are added, I will tell you: so that, if you prefer, you may read the headings only.

si nimis est legisse duos, tibi charta plicetur
altera: diuisum sic breue fiet opus. (Mart. 4.82.7–8)

If two is too much to read, you may fold up one of the rolls. Divided, the work will thus become short.

Only those who understand the playfulness of this invitation have what it takes to continue reading.

This is the kind of attitude we find in the epigrams spoken by Lycophron's *Alexandra* (*AP* 9.191)[48] and by Philitas' *klethre* (if this is really a book, as I will assume here, and if it is an epigram and not a fragment):

47 Cf. also Mart. 6.65.5–6, cited above.

48 On the identity of Lycophron, see Hollis (2007), who argues that this is the scholar and tragedian from Calchis (third century BCE).

Οὐκ ἂν ἐν ἡμετέροισι πολυγνάμπτοις λαβυρίνθοις
ῥηϊδίως προμόλοις ἐς φάος, αἴκε τύχῃς·
τοίους γὰρ Πριαμὶς Κασσάνδρη φοίβασε μύθους,
ἄγγελος οὓς βασιλεῖ ἔφρασε λοξοτρόχις.
εἰ δέ σε φίλατο Καλλιόπη, λάβε μ᾽ ἐς χέρας· εἰ δὲ
νῆϊς ἔφυς Μουσέων, χερσὶ βάρος φορέεις. (*AP* 9.191)

Not easily, being in my labyrinth of many turnings, will you find your way to the light, if at all. So ill to read is the prophetic message that Cassandra, Priam's daughter, tells here to the King in crooked speech. Yet, if Calliope loves you, take me up; but if you are ignorant of the Muses, I am a weight in your hands.

Οὔ μέ τις ἐξ ὀρέων ἀποφώλιος ἀγροιώτης
αἱρήσει κλήθρην αἱρόμενος μακέλην,
ἀλλ᾽ ἐπέων εἰδὼς κόσμον καὶ πολλὰ μογήσας
μύθων παντοίων οἶμον ἐπιστάμενος. (Philitas fr. 25 Spanoudakis)

It is not some benighted, mattock-raising rustic from the mountains who will remove me, an alder, but he who knows the arrangement of words and, having gone through much toil, knows the path of every kind of tale.

Like the book she introduces, Cassandra's discourse is not easy reading. Her message, which a slave reproduces for more than a thousand lines (did the tragedy's atypical structure lead the anonymous poet to endow the book with voice?), is λοξοτρόχις, a *hapax legomenon* based on words from the epilogue of the *Alexandra* (Lycoph. *Alex.* 1461–1474),[49] that is, from the few verses which, as the poem's prologue (1–3), do not convey the heroine's words. (Was the epigrammatist also lost in the labyrinth, being unable to enter the bulk of the poem?) The epigram plays with the Callimachean metaphor of the weight of poetry,[50] which is best known from Apollo's speech in the *Aetia* prologue (Callim. *Aet.* 1.23–24 Harder); also he who will not be able to "carry" the *Alexandra*, one "ignorant of the Muse," appears to take his characterization from the Telchines: νῆϊς ἔφυς Μουσέων, χερσὶ βάρος φορέεις (*AP* 9.191.6); νήιδες οἳ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι ("who, ignorant of the Muse, were not born as her friend," Callim. *Aet.* 1.2 Harder). Lycophron's *Alexandra* warns that it is difficult to find the way into the light from within its labyrinth, and that only a friend of the Muses will be able to carry it home;

49 West (2000).

50 As regards heaviness, it might be significant that, at the end of the prologue, the poet proudly states that not even the "weight" of old age, which is heavy on him (1.35–36), will alter his relationship with the Muses, whereas in the epigram it is the reader's relationship with the Muses that determines the book's weight.

for those who do not enjoy such intimacy with the goddesses, the book will become a burden.

Philitas' piece poses other questions. In the first couplet, the speaker identifies itself as an alder which the rustic from the mountains will not be able to cut down with an axe and remove—would be understandable without resorting to a metaphorical meaning, if not for the fact that the *alnus glutinosa* does not live in the mountains (Theoph. *Hist. plant.* 3.3.1).[51] In the second couplet, the *klethre* delineates the profile of the figure opposed to the rustic. He is endowed with specific qualities: εἰδὼς (3), ἐπιστάμενος (4), πολλὰ μογήσας (3); only he who went through this process is able to grasp the form (ἐπέων ... κόσμον, 3) and the contents (μύθων παντοίων οἶμον, 4). It becomes clear that what is at stake here is not a tree. And if it is not a tree, then the action is not that of cutting down and taking away. Actually, the verb αἱρήσει shows the same ambiguity as *uideor* in Martial 10.1 (*si nimius uideor seraque coronide longus / esse liber*, 1–2): both have a physical and an intellectual meaning, and the last one, "to grasp with the mind or understand" (*LSJ* s.v. αἱρέω), conforms to the erudition demanded from the man described in the second couplet (note εἰδὼς, πολλὰ μογήσας, ἐπιστάμενος, 3–4). In this context, the *klethre* has been identified with a book[52] (although tablets made of *alnus glutinosa* are rare and those found in Vindolanda can be explained by the abundance of that tree in the region).[53] This would make the epigram an epigraph for a book, and *klethre* would be a title or some way of referring to a work by Philitas.[54] The *klethre* comments

51 Spanoudakis (2001) 438.

52 Or another object related to writing. The *klethre* might also be a stock, a poetic symbol in Theoc. 7.43–44, 128–129; it would be, in that case, an *apophoreton*. See Bowie (1985) 75, accepted by Van Sickle (1975) 59 n. 61. By analogy with Antimachus' *Lyde*, the *klethre* would be a woman (maybe *Bittis*?), rejecting the rustic's love and opting for that of the scholar; see Reitzenstein (1893). Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1924) 1.116 supposes a textual error. See McKay (1978) 37 and Spanoudakis (2002) 318–320 for a synthesis of the interpretation of the word.

53 As for the material of the writing tablets, there is a parallel in Euripides, where *peuke* designates the writing tablets (Eur. *IA* 39, *Hipp.* 1253–1254; cf. also Pl. *Leg.* 741c and [Longin.] 4.6). A talking tablet has come down to us (*AP* 14.45, 60), posing an enigma on its own identity, and even the wax on a talking tablet speaks (*AP* 14.45). See Kuchenmüller (1928) 62; Bing (1988a) 33 n. 52; Spanoudakis (2002) 319.

54 *Klethre* can be the title of a book, but we possess no notice of such a work by Philitas, or a work which could be alluded to with reference to a *klethre*. The most seductive proposal makes *klethre* the lost work to which Callimachus alludes in the prologue of the *Aetia*; but this presupposes Housman's reading for the beginning of line 10, δρῦν. See McKay (1978) 36–44; Spanoudakis (2001) 438–441 and (2002) 321; Cameron (1995) 316–317 proposes an emphatic particle for the place where Housman reads δρῦν.

on its own quality by selecting the qualified reader. What is more, the epigrammatist seems to observe the imperative recognized by the *klethre* in line 3, putting much care into the structure of the epigram (ἐπέων … κόσμον, 3): he distinguishes the cultivated from the rustic with the rhetorical formula οὐ … / ἀλλ᾽ … (1–3), dividing the poem into two parts, each one extending to a distich; each distich comprises eleven words: seven in the hexameter, four in the pentameter. Furthermore, the book proffers a statement which is compatible with Callimachean aesthetics; it has even been argued that it might have influenced the *Aetia* prologue. Konstantinos Spanoudakis points out that the alder is a tall, imposing tree, and therefore its size could contrast with that of the book;[55] could Philitas' proverbial thinness[56] contrast with the "weight" of the alder? Bing persuasively suggests that the epigram alerts the reader to the book's allusive character. In fact, *klethre*'s speech is all the more interesting for this discussion because it has been claimed that it could have prefaced a book of epigrams by Philitas.[57] Be that as it may, the rustic appears to be the reader who is unprepared for the reading ahead of him.

Klethre's readers should be able to grasp its form and content: the book needs a reader who masters the arrangement of words (ἐπέων … κόσμον, 3) and every kind of tale (μύθων παντοίων, 4). Martial's book 10 longs for a reader who appreciates the arrangement of poems within the book, and therefore understands that its invitation to skip poems at will is parodic. For one ignorant of the Muses, the *Alexandra* will be a burden, and, one might add, Martial's tenth book will seem too long. Someone who cannot grasp the *klethre* will not understand the book, as in Martial only the reader who acknowledges he has to read through it is ready to grasp the collection. *Alexandra* and the *klethre* know they are hard reading, and they choose to warn the reader about it. They do not want to be simpler or easier to read; they just want the readers to know what kind of skills they are expected to have if they are to read them. In my opinion, this is overtly the case in Martial. Book 10 does not apologize for being long; it teases those who will judge it according to the wrong criteria.

55 Spanoudakis (2001) 439.

56 Cameron (1995) 488–493.

57 Kuchenmüller (1928) 62, with the agreement of Cataudella (1967) 404 and Spanoudakis (2002) 321.

3. *In the End*

The *Batrachomachia*—if the book is indeed the speaker—goes beyond all its predecessors when it comes to discussing the poet's aesthetic choice for *nugae*, acquiring a new language. The book also acts like a *grammaticus*, like some of its predecessors, and by doing so it takes part in a polemic about epigram's value as literature. So does the tenth book of Martial. It fears bad readers, like some of its Greek ancestors. Actually, it would have been a bold and suggestive move by Martial to try to ennoble the book by showing it tormented by the same problems as the cryptic *Alexandra* or the allusive *klethre*. Even though there is no textual evidence or verbal echoes, there are common features clearly belonging to the same tradition, and in my opinion these should not be dismissed as coincidences. They point to a common background to which the preface to the *Amores* also belongs. This is also the case when we focus on the book series in the *Apophoreta* as a whole. To me, it clearly revives the tradition of writing epigrams on poets, but it blurs the recognition of links to specific Greek poems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbamonte, G. (2011). "La *Silua Somnus* (5,4) di Stazio nella tradizione esegetica umanistica con un commento inedito di Aulo Giano Parrasio." *Paideia* 66: 9–51.

Acosta-Hughes, B. (2002). *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley.

Acosta-Hughes, B. and Barbantani, S. (2007). "Inscribing Lyric." In P. Bing and J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, 429–457. Leiden.

Acosta-Hughes, B. and Stephens, S.A. (2012). *Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets*. Cambridge.

Adamietz, J. (1970). "Jason und Hercules in den Epen des Apollonios Rhodios und Valerius Flaccus." *A&A* 16: 29–38.

———. (1976). *Zur Komposition der Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus*. Munich.

Adler, A. (1928–1938). *Lexicographi Graeci: Suidae lexicon*, 5 vols. Leipzig.

Agus, A. (2004). "Nota sull'onomastica dei Tespiadi." In R. Zucca, ed. *Le fonti classiche e la Sardegna: Atti del convegno di studi lanusei 29 dicembre 1998*, 71–85. Rome.

Ahl, F. (1985). *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca, NY.

———. (1986). "Statius' *Thebaid*. A Reconsideration." *ANRW* 2.35.2: 2803–2912.

Ahl, F., Davis, M.A., and Pomeroy, A. (1986). "Silius Italicus." *ANRW* 2.32.4: 2492–2561.

Albis, R.V. (1996). *Poet and Audience in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Diss. Yale University.

Albrecht, M. von (1964). *Silius Italicus: Freiheit und Gebundenheit römischer Epik*. Amsterdam.

———. (2011). "Tradition und Originalität bei Silius Italicus." In L. Castagna, G. Galimberti Biffino, and C. Riboldi, eds. *Studi su Silio Italico*, 89–109. Milan.

Ambaglio, D., Landucci, F. and Bravi, L. (2008). *Diodoro Siculo*. Milan.

Anderson, A.R. (1928). "Heracles and his Successors: A Study of a Heroic Ideal and the Recurrence of a Heroic Type." *HSPh* 39: 7–58.

Anzinger, S. (2007). *Schweigen im römischen Epos: Zur Dramaturgie der Kommunikation bei Vergil, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus und Statius*. Berlin.

Argentieri, L. (2003). *Gli epigrammi degli Antipatri*. Bari.

Aricò, G. (1961). "Stazio e l'Ipsipile euripidea. Note sull'imitazione staziana." *Dioniso* 35: 56–67.

———. (1996). "Rileggendo l'*Achilleide*." In F. Delarue, S. Georgacopoulou, P. Laurens, and A.-M. Taisne, eds. *Epicedion. Hommage à P. Papinius Statius, 96–1996*, 185–199. Poitiers.

Arkins, B. (1982). "Tradition reshaped: Language and Style in Euripides' *Medea* 1–19, Ennius' *Medea exul* 1–9 and Catullus 64.1–30." *Ramus* 11: 116–133.

Ash, R. (2010). "*Tarda moles ciuilis belli*: The Weight of the Past in Tacitus' *Histories*." In B.W. Breed, C. Damon, A. Rossi, eds. *Citizens of Discord: Rome and its Civil Wars*, 119–131. New York.

Asper, M. (1997) *Onomata allotria: Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos*. Stuttgart.

———. (2004). *Kallimachos: Werke*. Darmstadt.

Augoustakis, A. (2008). "An Insomniac's Lament: The End of Poetic Power in Statius' *Siluae* 5.4." In C. Deroux, ed. *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 14, 339–347. Brussels.

———. (2010a). *Motherhood and the Other: Fashioning Female Power in Flavian Epic*. Oxford.

———. (2010b). "Silius Italicus, A Flavian Poet." In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, 3–23. Leiden.

———. (2012a). "Daphnis' *deductum nomen / carmen* in Silius' Sicilian Pastoral (*Pun.* 14.462–476)." *Trends in Classics* 4.1: 132–152.

———. (2012b). "*Per hunc utero quem linquis nostro*: Mothers in Flavian Epic." In L. Petersen and P.B. Salzman, eds. *Mothering and Motherhood in Ancient Greece and Rome*, 205–223. Austin.

———. (2013). "*Teichoscopia* and *Katabasis*: The Poetics of Spectatorship in Flavian Epic." In G. Manuwald and A. Voigt, eds. *Flavian Epic Interactions*, 157–175. Berlin.

———. (2014). "Statius and Senecan Drama." In W.J. Dominik and C. Newlands, eds. *Brill Companion to Statius*. Leiden.

Austin, R.G. (1964). *P. Vergili Maronis, Aeneidos liber secundus*, Oxford.

———. (1977). *P. Vergili Maronis, Aeneidos liber sextus*. Oxford.

Autore, O. (1937). *Marziale e l'epigramma greco*. Palermo.

Babbitt, F.C. trans. (1936). *Plutarch's Moralia. Vol. IV: 263D–351B*. Cambridge, Mass.

Bahrenfuss, W. (1951). *Das Abenteuer der Argonauten auf Lemnos bei Apollonios Rhodios (Argo. 1.601 bis 909), Valerius Flaccus (Argo. 2.72 bis 430) und Papinius Statius (Theb. 4.746 bis 5.498)*. Diss. University of Kiel.

Baier, T. (1998). "Ursache und Funktion des Krieg gegen Perses in den *Argonautica* des Valerius Flaccus." In U. Eigler, E. Lefèvre, and G. Manuwald, eds. *Ratis omnia uincet: Neue Untersuchungen zu den Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus*, 319–335. Munich.

———. (2011). "Der Götterapparat bei Silius Italicus." In L. Castagna, G. Galimberti Biffino, and C. Riboldi, eds. *Studi su Silio Italico*, 281–296. Milan.

Baldry, H.C. (1952). "Who Invented the Golden Age?" *CQ* 2: 83–92.

Baldwin, B. (1995). "The Sexual Tastes of Remmius Palaemon." *Hermes* 123: 380–382.

Balland, A. (1998). "Quelques relations aristocratiques de Martial." *REA* 100: 43–63.

Bandera, C. (1981). "Sacrificial Levels in Virgil's *Aeneid*." *Arethusa* 14: 217–239.

Bannon, C.J. (1997). *The Brothers of Romulus*. Princeton.

Barchiesi, A. (1996). "La guerra di Troia non avrà luogo: Il proemio dell'*Achilleide* di Stazio." *AION(filol)* 18: 45–62.

———. (1997). "Virgilian Narrative: Ecphrasis." In C. Martindale, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, 271–281. Cambridge.

———. (1999). "Representations of Suffering and Interpretation in the *Aeneid*." In P.R. Hardie, ed. *Virgil: Critical Assessments of Classical Authors. Volume III: The Aeneid*, 324–344. London.

———. (2001). *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*. London.

———. (2005). "The Search for the Perfect Book: A PS to the New Posidippus." In K. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. 320–342. Oxford.

Barich, M.J. (1982). *Aspects of the Poetic Technique of Valerius Flaccus*. Diss. Yale University.

Barnes, M.H. (2003). *Inscribed Kleos: Aetiological Contexts in Apollonius of Rhodes*. Diss. University of Missouri-Columbia.

Barnes, W.R. (1981). "The Trojan War in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*." *Hermes* 109: 360–370.

Bartsch, S. (1997). *Ideology in Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War*. Cambridge, Mass.

Barwick, K. (1958). "Zyklen bei Martial und in den kleinen Gedichten des Catull." *Philologus* 102: 284–318.

Bassett, E.L. (1966). "Hercules and the Hero of the *Punica*." In L. Wallach, ed. *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of H. Caplan*, 258–273. Ithaca, NY.

Batstone, W. (1998). "Dry Pumice and the Programmatic Language of Catullus 1." *CPh* 93: 125–135.

Beck, J.-W. (1996). *"Lesbia" und "Juventius": Zwei libelli im Corpus Catullianum. Untersuchungen zur Publikationsform und Authentizität der überlieferten Gedichtfolge*. Göttingen.

Ben-Porat, Z. (1992). "Poetics of the Homeric Simile and the Theory of (Poetic) Simile." *Poetics Today* 13: 737–769.

Berkowitz, G.C. (2003). *Narrative Problems in Apollonius' Argonautica*. Diss. University of Cincinnati.

Bernabé, A. ed. (1996). *Poetarum epicorum Graecorum testimonia et fragmenta*. Stuttgart.

Bernstein, N.W. (2008). *In the Image of the Ancestors: Narratives of Kinship in Flavian Epic*. Toronto.

———. (2010). "Family and State in the *Punica*." In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, 377–400. Leiden.

———. (forthcoming). "*Romanas ueluti saeuissima cum legiones Tisiphone regesque mouet*: Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* and the Flavian Era." In M.A.J. Heerink and G. Manuwald, eds. *Brill's Companion to Valerius Flaccus*. Leiden.

Bessone, F. (1991). "Valerio Flacco e l'Apollonio commentato: Proposte." *MD* 26: 31–46.

———. (2011). *La Tebaide di Stazio: Epica e potere*. Pisa.

———. (2013). "Religion and Power in the *Thebaid*." In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*, 145–161. Oxford.

Bettenworth, A. (2004). *Gastmahlszenen in der antiken Epik von Homer bis Claudian: Diachrone Untersuchungen zur Szenentypik*. Göttingen.

———. (2007). "The Mutual Influence of Inscribed and Literary Epigram." In P. Bing and J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, 69–93. Leiden.

Bettini, M. (1977). "Ennio in Silio Italico: A proposito dei proemi al I e al VII degli *Annales* e del proemio allo *Scipio*." *RFIC* 105: 425–447.

Beye, C.R. (1982). *Epic and Romance in the Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Structures*. Carbondale, Ill.

Billerbeck, M. (1986a). "Aspects of Stoicism in Flavian Epic." *PLLS* 5: 341–356.

———. (1986b). "Stoizismus in der römischen Epik neronischer und flavischer Zeit." *ANRW* 2.32.5: 3116–3151.

Bilmes, J. (1994). "Constituting Silence: Life in the World of Total Meaning." *Semiotics* 98.1–2: 73–87.

Binder, G. and Hamm, U. (1998). "Die 'Locke der Berenike' und der Ursprung der römischen Liebeselegie." In A.E. Radke, ed. *Candide Iudex: Beiträge zur augusteischen Dichtung. Festschrift für Walter Wimmel zum 75. Geburtstag*, 13–34. Stuttgart.

Bing, P. (1988a). *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*. Göttingen.

———. (1988b). "Theocritus' Epigrams on the Statues of Ancient Poets." *A&A* 34: 117–123.

———. (1993). "The Bios-Tradition and Poet's Lives in Hellenistic Poetry." In R.M. Rosen and J. Farrell, eds. *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*, 619–631. Ann Arbor.

Biondi G.G. (1980). "Mito o mitopoiesi?" *MD* 5: 125–144.

Birt, T. (1882). *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur* (*mit Beiträgen zur Textgeschichte des Theokrit, Catull, Properz und anderen Autoren*). Berlin.

Bömer, F. (1976). *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen Buch IV–V*. Heidelberg.

Bonadeo, A. (2007). "I classici nella paideia di P. Papinio (Stat. *Silu*. 5, 3)." In A. Bonadeo and E. Romano, eds. *Dialogando con il Passato: Permanenze e innovazioni nella cultura latina di età flavia*, 160–176. Florence.

———. (2010). *L'Hercules Epitrapezios Novi Vindicis: Introduzione e commento a Stat. Silu. 4, 6*. Naples.

Bonadeo, A., Canobbio, A., and Gasti, F. eds. (2011). *Filellenismo e identità romana in età flavia: Atti della VIII Giornata ghisleriana di Filologia classica* (*Pavia, 10–11 novembre 2009*). Pavia.

Bond, G.W. ed. (1963). *Euripides: Hypsipyle*. Oxford.

Borzsák, S. (1982). "Die *Punica* des Silius Italicus und die Alexander-Überlieferung." In G. Wirth, K-H. Schwarte, J. Heinrichs, eds. *Romanitas-Christianitas: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Literatur der römischen Kaiserzeit* (*J. Straub gewidmet*), 164–174. Berlin.

Bossi, F. (1986). *Studi sul Margite*. Ferrara.

Bouquet, J. (2001). *Le songe dans l'épopée latine d'Ennius à Claudien*. Brussels.

Bowersock, G.W. (1965). *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford.

Bowie, E.L. (1985). "Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*, Philetas and Longus." *CQ* 35: 67–91.

Boyancé, P. (1935). "Un rite de purification dans les *Argonautiques* de Valérius Flaccus." *REL* 13: 107–136.

Boyd, B.W. (1997). *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the Amores*. Ann Arbor.

———. (2002). "The *Amores*: The Invention of Ovid." In B.W. Boyd, ed. *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, 91–116. Leiden.

Boyle, A.J. (1993). *Roman Epic*. London.

Boyle, A.J. and Sullivan, J.P. (1991). *Roman Poets of the Early Empire*. London.

Bramble, J.C. (1974). *Persius and the Programmatic Satire: A Study in Form and Imagery*. Cambridge.

Braund, S. trans. (1992). *Lucan: Civil War*. Oxford.

———. (1996a). "The Solitary Feast: The Contradiction in Terms." *BICS* 41: 37–52.
———. (1996b). "Ending Epic: Statius, Theseus and a Merciful Release." *PCPhS* 42: 1–23.
———. (2009). *A Lucan Reader: Selections from Civil War*. Mundelein, Ill.
———. (2010). "Introduction." In C. Tesoriero, ed. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Lucan*, 1–13. Oxford.
Brenk, F. (1999) *Clothed in Purple Light: Studies in Vergil and in Latin Literature, Including Aspects of Philosophy, Religion, Magic, Judaism and the New Testament Background*. Stuttgart.
Bretzigheimer, G. (2001). *Ovids Amores: Poetik in der Erotik*. Tübingen.
Brouwers, J.H. (1982). "Zur Lucan-Imitation bei Silius Italicus." In J. den Boeft and A.H.M. Kessels, eds. *Actus: Studies in Honour of H.L.W. Nelson*, 73–87. Utrecht.
Brown, E.L. (1963). *Numeri Vergiliani: Studies in Eclogues and Georgics*. Brussels.
Brown, J. (1994). *Into the Woods: Narrative Studies in the Thebaid of Statius with Special Reference to Books IV–VI*. Diss. Cambridge University.
Bruère, R.T. (1958). "Color Ovidianus in Silius' *Punica* 1–7." In N.I. Herescu, ed. *Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide*, 475–499. Paris.
———. (1959). "Color Ovidianus in Silius' *Punica* 8–17." *CPh* 54: 228–245.
Burck, E. (1970). "Kampf und Tod des Cyzicus bei Valerius Flaccus." *REL* 47: 173–198.
———. (1978). *Unwetterszenen bei den flavischen Epikern*. Wiesbaden.
———. (1981). "Epische Bestattungszenen: Ein literarhistorischer Vergleich." In E. Lefèvre, ed. *Vom Menschenbild in der römischen Literatur*, 429–487. Heidelberg.
———. (1988). "*Fides* in den *Punica* des Silius Italicus." In J. Safarewicz, ed. *Munera philologica et historica Mariano Plezia oblata*, 49–60. Wroclaw.
Burgess, J.F. (1972). "Statius' Altar of Mercy." *CQ* 22: 339–349.
Burman, P. ed. (1724). *C. Valerii Flacci Setini Balbi Argonauticon libri octo cum notis integris Ludovici Carrionis et selectis Aegidii Maserii, Joannis Baptistae Pii, Joannis Weitzii et aliorum, curante Petro Burmanno qui et suas adnotationes adiecit*. Leiden.
Burnikel, W. (1980). *Untersuchungen zur Struktur des Witzepigramms bei Lukillios und Martial*. Wiesbaden.
Butrica, J.L. (1983). "Martial's Little Livy (14.190)." *CB* 59: 9–11.
Byre, C. (2002). *A Reading of Apollonius Rhodius' Argonautica: The Poetics of Uncertainty*. Lewiston, NY.
Byrne, S.N. (2004). "Martial's Fiction: Domitius Marsus and Maecenas." *CQ* 54: 255–265.
Cairns, F. (1979). *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge.
———. (1989). *Virgil's Augustan Epic*. Cambridge.
Cameron, A. (1968). "The First Edition of Ovid's *Amores*." *CQ* 18: 320–333.
———. (1982). "Strato and Rufinus." *CQ* 32: 162–173.
———. (1993). *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford.
———. (1995). *Callimachus and his Critics*. Princeton.
Campanini, C. (1996). *Saggio di commento a Valerio Flacco* (*Arg. 4.99–198*). Florence.
Cancik-Lindemaier, H. (1971). "Ein Mahl vor Hercules. Ein Versuch zu Statius, *Silue* IV 6: Hercules Epitrapezios." *AU* 14.3: 43–65.
Canobbio, A. (2005). "Il libro VIII di Marziale e la ricerca di una identità augustea." In

F. Gasti and G. Mazzoli, eds. *Modelli letterari e ideologia nell'età flavia: Atti della III Giornata ghisleriana di Filologia classica* (*Pavia, 30–31 ottobre 2003*), 127–162. Pavia.
———. (2008). "*Epigrammata longa* e *breues libelli*: Dinamiche formali dell'epigramma marzialiano." In A.M. Morelli, ed. *Epigramma longum: Da Marziale alla tarda antichità. Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 29–31 maggio 2006*, 169–193. Cassino.
———. (2011a). *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton liber quintus*. Naples.
———. (2011b). "Parole greche in Marziale: Tipoligie di utilizzo e tre problemi filologici (3,20,5; 3,77,10; 9,44,6)." In A. Bonadeo, A. Canobbio, and F. Gasti, eds. *Filellenismo e identità romana in età flavia: Atti della VIII Giornata ghisleriana di Filologia classica* (*Pavia, 10–11 novembre 2009*), 59–89. Pavia.
Carrai, S. (1990). *Ad somnum: L'invocazione al sonno nella lirica italiana*. Padua.
Cartledge, P., Garnsey, P. and Gruen, E. eds. (1997). *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, Hostory and Historiography*. Berkeley.
Casali, S. (2006). "The Poet at War: Ennius on the Field in Silius's *Punica*." *Arethusa* 39: 569–593.
Castelletti, C. (2008). "Riflessioni sugli acrostici di Valerio Flacco." *GIF* 60: 219–234.
———. (2012a). "Following Aratus' Plow: Vergil's Signature in the *Aeneid*." *MH* 69: 83–95.
———. (2012b). "A 'Greek' Acrostic in Valerius Flaccus (3.430–434)." *Mnemosyne* 65: 319–323.
———. (2012c). "Why is Jason Climbing the Dragon? A Hidden Catasterism in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* 8." *ICS* 37: 141–165.
Caston, R.R. (2012). *The Elegiac Passion: Jealousy in Roman Love Elegy*. Oxford.
Cataudella, Q. (1927). "Riflessi virgiliani nel romanzo di Caritone." *Athenaeum* 5: 302–312.
———. (1967). "Hellenistica (Filita, Menandro, Callimaco, Teocrito, Eroda)." *Helikon* 7: 402–413.
Cessi, C. (1907). "La critica letteraria di Callimaco." *SIFC* 15: 1–107.
Champlin, E. (2003). "Agamemnon at Rome: Roman Dynasts and Greek Heroes." In D. Braund and C. Gill, eds. *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome: Studies in Honour of T.P. Wiseman*, 295–319. Exeter.
Charlesworth, M.P. (1937). "Flaviana." *JRS* 27: 54–62.
———. (1954). "The Flavian Dynasty." In S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock, and M.P. Charlesworth, eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol XI: The Imperial Peace A.D. 70–192*, 1–19. Cambridge.
Chinn, C.M. (2011). "Statius, Orpheus, and Callimachus: *Thebaid* 2.269–296." *Helios* 38: 79–101.
———. (2013). "Orphic Ritual and Myth in the *Thebaid*." In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*, 319–334. Oxford.
Chroust A.H. (1968). "Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's Philosopher King." *RhM* 111: 16–22.
Ciccarelli, I. (2005). "I modelli del Palinuro Virgiliano." *BStudLat* 35: 479–494.
Citroni, M. (1968). "Motivi di polemica letteraria negli epigrammi di Marziale." *DArch* 2: 259–301.

———. (1975). *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton liber primus*. Florence.
———. (2001). "Affermazioni di priorità e coscienza di progresso artistico nei poeti latini." In E.A. Schmidt, ed. *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine*, 267–304. Geneva.
———. (2003). "Marziale, Plinio il Giovane e il problema dell'identità di genere dell'epigramma latino." In F. Bertini, ed. *Giornate filologiche Francesco della Corte*, 3.7–29. Genoa.
———. (2006). "Quintilian and the Perception of the System of Poetic Genres in the Flavian Age." In R.R. Nauta, H.-J. van Dam, and J.J.L. Smolenaars, eds. *Flavian Poetry*, 1–19. Leiden.
Clare, R.J. (1997). "Catullus 64 and the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius: Allusion and Exemplarity." *PCPS* 42: 60–88.
———. (2002). *The Path of the Argo: Language, Imagery and Narrative in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Cambridge.
Clausen, W. (1964). "Callimachus and Latin Poetry." *GRBS* 5: 181–196.
Clauss, J.J. (1993). *The Best of the Argonauts: The Redefinition of the Epic Hero in Book One of Apollonius' Argonautica*. Berkeley.
———. (2000). "Cosmos Without Imperium: The *Argonautica*'s Journey Through Time." In A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker, eds. *Apollonius Rhodius*, 11–32. Leuven.
Clinton, K. (1972). "*Publius Papinius St*[—] and Eleusis." *TAPhA* 103: 79–82.
———. (1989). "The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors, Second Century B.C. to A.D. 267." *ANRW* 2.18.2: 1499–1539.
Clua Serena, J.-A. (1987). "En torno a las correspondencias entre epigramas griegos y epigramas satiricos de Marcial." In *Actas del simposio sobre Marco Valerio Marcial, poeta de Bílbilis y de Roma* (*Calatayud, mayo 1986*), 1.103–107. Zaragoza.
Cockle, W.E.H. ed. (1987). *Euripides: Hypsipyle*. Rome.
Cohoon, J.W. and Lamar Crosby, H. transl. (1932). *Dio Chrysostom*, 5 vols. Cambridge, Mass.
Coleman, K.M. (1988). *Statius, Siluae IV*. Oxford.
———. (1993). Review of J.P. Sullivan, *Martial: The Unexpected Classic*. *JRS* 83: 221–222.
———. (2006). *Martial, Liber Spectaculorum*. Oxford.
Collard, C. and Cropp, M.J. trans. (2008). *Euripides. Vol. VIII. Fragments: Oedipus-Chrysippus, Other Fragments*. Cambridge, Mass.
Collard, C., Cropp, M.J., and Gibert, J. trans. (2004^2). *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays with Introductions, Translations and Commentaries*. Warminster.
Constantakopoulou, C. (2010). "Dionysios Scytobrachion." In I. Worthington, ed. *Brill's New Jacoby 32*. Leiden. (http://www.encquran.brill.nl/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/dionysios-scytobrachion-32-a32, accessed 09/25/2013).
Conte, G.B. (1994) *Latin Literature: A History* (trans. J. Solodow). Baltimore.
Corbeill, A. (1997). "Dining Deviants in Roman Political Invective." In J.P. Hallett and M.B. Skinner, eds. *Roman Sexualities*, 99–128. Princeton.
Corti, R. (1991). "La tematica dell'*otium* nelle *Siluae* di Stazio." In Mario Pani, ed. *Continuità e trasformazioni fra repubblica e principato: Istituzioni, politica, società*, 189–224. Bari.
Courtney, E. (1990). "Greek and Latin Acrostichs." *Philologus* 134: 3–13.

———. ed. (1992). *P. Papini Statii Siluae*. Oxford.

Cowan, R. (2002). *In my beginning is my end: Origins, Cities and Foundations in Flavian Epic*. Diss. Oxford University.

———. (2011). "Introduction." In J. Davie, tr. *Horace, Satires and Epistles: A New Translation*, i–xxvii. Oxford.

———. (2013). "Back Out of Hell: The Virtual *Katabasis* and Initiation of Silius' Minucius." In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*, 217–232. Oxford.

Cozzolino, A. (2004). "*Nox erat* … (Il tempo della notte come tempo della tenebra interiore)." In U. Criscuolo, ed. *Societas studiorum: Per Salvatore D'Elia*, 247–256. Naples.

Cresci Marrone, G. (1983–1984). "Alessandro in età neroniana: Victor o praedo?" *AIV* 142: 75–93.

Criado, C. (2000). *La teologìa de la Tebaida Estaciana: El anti-virgilianismo de un clasicista*. Hildesheim.

Crowther, N.B. (1979). "Water and Wine as Symbols of Inspiration." *Mnemosyne* 32: 1–11.

Cunningham, J.V. (1948). "Statius, Keats, and Wordsworth." *PhQ* 27: 359–371.

Cuypers, M. (1997). *Apollonius Rhodius, Argonautica 2.1–310: A Commentary*. Diss. University of Leiden.

Damschen, G. (2004). "Das lateinische Akrostichon: Neue Funde bei Ovid sowie Vergil, Grattius, Manilius und Silius Italicus." *Philologus* 148: 88–115.

Damschen, G. and Heil, A. (2004). *Marcus Valerius Martialis, Epigrammaton liber decimus*. Frankfurt am Main.

Danielewicz, J. (2005). "Further Hellenistic Acrostics: Aratus and Others." *Mnemosyne* 58: 321–334.

———. (forthcoming). "Vergil's *certissima signa* Reinterpreted: The Aratean LEPTE-Acrostic in *Georgics* 1." *Eos*.

Davis, M. (1989). "*Ratis audax*: Valerius Flaccus' Bold Ship." *Ramus* 18: 46–73.

De Angeli, E.S. (1969). "A Literary Chill: Catullus 44." *CW* 62: 354–356.

De Arnim, J. ed. (1893–1896). *Dionis Prusaensis quem uocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia*, 2 vols. Berlin.

De Blois, L. (2010). "Crossing Status Barriers: The Disruption of an Imperial Banquet by Angry Soldiers in Plutarch's *Otho*." In J. Ribeiro Ferreira, D. Leão, M. Tröster, and P. Barata Dias, eds. *Symposion and Philanthropia in Plutarch*, 223–230. Coimbra.

DeForest, M.M. (1994). *Apollonius' Argonautica: A Callimachean Epic*. Leiden.

De Jong, I. (1987). "The Voice of Anonymity: *tis*-speeches in the *Iliad*." *Eranos* 85: 69–84.

Delage, É. (1930). *La géographie dans les Argonautiques d'Apollonios de Rhodes*. Bordeaux.

D'Elia, S. (1958). "Il problema cronologico degli *Amores*." In N.I. Herescu, ed. *Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide*, 210–223. Paris.

Della Corte, F. (1986). "Gli *Amores* di Ovidio ripudiati." In U.J. Stache, W. Maaz, and F. Wagner, eds. *Kontinuität und Wandel. Lateinische Poesie von Naevius bis Baudelaire: Franco Munari zum 65. Geburtstag*, 70–78. Hildesheim.

Delz, J. ed. (1987). *Silius Italicus, Punica*. Stuttgart.

Dennis, R.G. and Putnam, M.C.J. trans. (2012). *The Complete Poems of Tibullus*. Berkeley.

Deremetz, A. (1995). *Le miroir des Muses: Poétiques de la réflexivité à Rome*. Villeneuve d'Ascq.

Desideri, P. (2005a). "Intellettuali greci e impero romano: Una vicenda attuale." In M. Pani, ed. *Storia romana e storia moderna: Fasi in prospettiva*, 41–58. Bari.

———. (2005b). "Impero di Alessandro e impero di Roma secondo Plutarco." In A. Casanova, ed. *Plutarco e l'età ellenistica: Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi Firenze, 23–24 settembre 2004*, 3–21. Florence.

———. (2007). "Dio's Exile: Politics, Philosophy, Literature." In I.F. Gaertner, ed. *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, 193–207. Leiden.

Dewar, M. (1991). *Statius, Thebaid IX*. Oxford.

Dietrich, J.S. (1999). "*Thebaid*'s Feminine Ending." *Ramus* 28: 40–53.

Dilke, O.A. ed. (2009[3]). *Statius' Achilleid*. Chicago.

Dodds, E. (1951). *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Oxford.

Dominik, W.J. (1994). *The Mythic Voice of Statius: Power and Politics in the Thebaid*. Leiden.

———. (1997). "*Ratio et dei*: Psychology and the Supernatural in the Lemnian Episode.". In C. Deroux, ed., *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 8, 29–50. Brussels.

Dorfbauer, L.J. (2008). "Hannibal, Ennius und Silius Italicus: Beobachtungen zum 12. Buch der *Punica*." *RhM* 151: 83–108.

Dräger, P. (1995). "Jasons Mutter: Wandlung von einer griechischen Heroine zu einer römischen *Matrona*." *Hermes* 123: 470–489.

———. (1999). "War die Argo das erste Schiff?" *RhM* 142: 419–422.

———. trans. (2003). *C. Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica: Die Sendung der Argonauten*. Frankfurt am Main.

Duckworth, G.E. (1994[2]). *The Nature of Roman Comedy*. Norman, Okl.

Duff, J.D. trans. (1934). *Silius Italicus*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.

Dufner, C.M. (1988). *The Odyssey in the Argonautica: Reminiscence, Revision, Reconstruction*. Diss. Princeton University.

Durbec, Y. (2008). "Several Deaths in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*." *Myrtia* 23: 53–73.

Duret, L. (1986). "Dans l'ombre des plus grands II: Poètes et prosateurs mal connus de la latinité d'argent." *ANRW* 2.32.5: 3152–3346.

Easterling, P.E. and Knox, B.M.W. (1985). "Books and Readers in the Greek World." In *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. Vol. I: Greek Literature*, 1–41. Cambridge.

Eden, P.T. (1989). "Problems in Martial (II) (1.17; 1.92; 1.100; 10.83)." *Mnemosyne* 42: 119–124.

Edmonds, J.M. trans. (1931). *Greek Elegy and Iambus*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.

Edwards, M.J. (1999). "The Role of Hercules in Valerius Flaccus." *Latomus* 58: 150–163.

Ehlers, W.W. (1971–1972). "Valerius Flaccus 1949 bis 1971." *Lustrum* 16: 105–142.

———. ed. (1980). *Valerius Flaccus*. Stuttgart.

Ehrhardt, P. (1974). *Satirische Epigramme auf Ärzte: Eine medizinhistorische Studie*

auf der Grundlage des XI. Buches der Anthologia Palatina. Diss. Erlangen-Nürnberg.
Eigler, U. (1988). *Monologische Redeformen bei Valerius Flaccus*. Frankfurt am Main.
Eissfeldt, E. (1904). "Zu den Vorbildern des Statius." *Philologus* 63: 378–424.
Elliger, W. (1975). *Die Darstellung der Landschaft in der griechischen Dichtung*. Berlin.
Ephratt, M. (2008). "The Functions of Silence." *Journal of Pragmatics* 40.11: 1909–1938.
Erasmo, M. (2004). *Roman Tragedy: Theatre to Theatricality*. Austin.
Fabbrini, D. (2005). "Callimaco, SH 260A, 8 e le sorti di Molorco in Marziale, IV 64 e Stazio, *Siluae* III 1: Il tema dell'ospitalità umile nella poesia celebrativa e d'occasione di età flavia." *SIFC* 3: 195–222.
Fabre-Serris, J. (2008). *Rome, l'Arcadie et la mer des Argonautes*. Villeneuve d' Ascq.
Fairclough, H.R. trans. (1929). *Horace: Satires, Epistles, and Ars poetica*. Cambridge, Mass.
Fairclough, H.R. and Goold, G.P. trans. (1999–2000). *Virgil*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.
Fantham, E. (1986). "ζηλοτυπία: A Brief Excursion into Sex, Violence, and Literary History." *Phoenix* 40: 45–57.
———. (1999). "*Chironis exemplum*: On Teachers and Surrogate Fathers in *Achilleid* and *Siluae*." *Hermathena* 167: 59–70.
Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. (2004). *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.
Faraone, C.A. (1990). "Aphrodite's ΚΕΣΤΟΣ and Apples for Atalanta: Aphrodisiacs in Early Greek Myth and Ritual." *Phoenix* 44: 219–243.
Farrell, J. (2003). "Classical Genre in Theory and Practice." *New Literary History* 34: 383–408.
———. (2010). "Argonautic Constellations in Latin Poetry." Paper Presented at *Aratus and the Astronomical Tradition*, St. Andrews, Scotland.
Fearnley, H. (1998). *Reading Martial's Rome*. Diss. University of Southern California.
———. (2003). "Reading the Imperial Revolution: Martial, *Epigrams* 10." In A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik, eds. *Flavian Rome*, 613–635. Leiden.
Fedeli, P. (1983). *Catullus' Carmen 61*. Amsterdam.
———. (2004). "Marziale Catulliano." *Humanitas* 56: 161–189.
Fedeli, P. and Ciccarelli, I. eds. (2008). *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina liber IV*. Florence.
Feeney, D.C. (1991). *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford.
———. (1993). "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets." In N. Rudd, ed. *Horace 2000: A Celebration*, 41–63. Ann Arbor.
———. (2007). *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley.
Feeney, D.C. and Nelis D. (2005). "Two Virgilian Acrostics: *certissima signa*?" *CQ* 55: 644–646.
Ferenczi, A. (2007). "Modernität in klassizistischem Mantel." In I. Tar and P. Mayer, eds. *Klassizismus und Modernität: Beiträge der internationalen Konferenz in Szeged (11.-13. September 2003)*, 149–155. Szeged.
Ferguson, J. (1963). "Catullus and Martial." *PACA* 6: 3–15.
Fernandelli, M. (2006). "La maniera classicistica di Silio: Tre esempi dal libro VII." *Incontri Triestini di Filologia Classica* 5: 73–118.
Ferrill, A. (1965). "Otho, Vitellius and the Propaganda of Vespasian." *CJ* 60: 267–269.

Ferriss, J.L. (2009). "Catullus Poem 71: Another Foot Pun." *CPh* 104: 376–384.
Fitch, J.G. (1976). "Aspects of Valerius Flaccus' Use of Similes." *TAPhA* 196: 113–124.
———. trans. (2004). *Seneca: Tragedies*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.
Fitzgerald, W. (1995). *Catullan Provocations: Lyric Poetry and the Drama of Position*. Berkeley.
———. (2007). *Martial: The World of the Epigram*. Chicago.
Foley, H.P. (2001). *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton.
Fortenbaugh, W.W. and Schütrumpf, E. eds. (2001). *Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation, and Discussion*. New Brunswick.
Fortgens, H.W. (1934). *P. Papinii Statii de Opheltis funere carmen epicum, Theb. Lib. VI 1–295, uersione Batava commentarioque exegetico instructum*. Zwolle.
Foster, B.O. trans. (1929). *Livy: Books XI–XII*. Cambridge, Mass.
Fowler, D.P. (1983). "An Acrostic in Vergil (*Aeneid* 7.601–604)?" *CQ* 33: 298.
———. (1995). "Martial and the Book." *Ramus* 24: 31–58.
———. (1997). "Second Thoughts on Closure." In H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn, and D. Fowler, eds. *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*, 3–22. Princeton.
———. (2000). *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. Oxford.
Fox, M. (2007). *Cicero's Philosophy of History*. Oxford.
Fraenkel, E. (1957). *Horace*. Oxford.
Fränkel, H. (1968). *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios*. Munich.
Freudenburg, K. (1993). *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*. Princeton.
Friedländer, L. ed. (1886). *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton libri*. Leipzig.
Friedrich, G. (1907). "Zu Martial." *Rheinisches Museum* 62: 366–379.
Friedrich, W.H. (1934). "Euripideisches in der lateinischen Literatur." *Hermes* 69: 300–315.
Fuà, O. (1986). "Il rifacimento eroico di Esone in Valerio Flacco. L'addio a Giasone (I.320–347)." *GIF* 38: 267–273.
Fucecchi, M. (1990). "Il declino di Annibale nei *Punica*." *Maia* 42: 151–166.
———. (1993). "Lo spettacolo delle virtù nel giovane eroe predestinato: Analisi della figura di Scipione in Silio Italico." *Maia* 45: 17–48.
———. (1996). "Il restauro dei modelli antichi: Tradizione epica e tecnica manieristica in Valerio Flacco." *MD* 36: 101–165.
———. ed. (2006). *Una guerra in Colchide: Valerio Flacco, Argonautiche 6.1–426*. Pisa.
———. (2010). "The Shield and the Sword: Q. Fabius Maximus and M. Claudius Marcellus as Models of Heroism in Silius' *Punica*." In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, 219–239. Leiden.
———. (2012). "Epica, filosofia della storia e legittimazione del potere imperiale: La profezia di Giove nel libro III dei *Punica* (e un'indicazione di percorso per l'epos storico)." In T. Baier, ed. *Götter und menschliche Willensfreiheit von Lucan bis Silius ltalicus*, 235–254. Munich.
Gabathuler, M. (1937). *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter*. Diss. Basel-St. Gallen.
Gabba, E. (1975). "P. Cornelio Scipione Africano e la leggenda." *Athenaeum* 3: 3–17.
Gain, D.B. (1976). *The Aratus Ascribed to Germanicus Caesar*. London.
Gaisser, J.H. (1995). "Threads in the Labyrinth: Competing Views and Voices in Catullus 64." *AJPh* 116: 579–616.

Galán Vioque, G. (2002). *Martial, Book VII: A Commentary*. Leiden.

Gale, M.R. (1997). "The Shield of Turnus (*Aeneid* 7.783–792)." *G&R* 44: 176–196.

———. (2000). *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The Georgics, Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition*. Cambridge.

Galimberti Biffino, G. (2008). "*Murmur*: Riflessioni sulla sonorità nella *Pharsalia* di Lucano." In F. Galtier and Y. Perrin, eds. *Ars Pictoris, Ars Scriptoris. Peinture, Littérature, Histoire. Mélanges offerts à Jean-Michel Croisille*, 209–220. Clermont-Ferrand.

Galinsky, G.K. (1990). "Hercules in the *Aeneid*." In S.J. Harrison, ed. *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, 277–294. Oxford.

Galli, D. (2002). "Influssi del *Thyestes* di Seneca nel libro I degli *Argonautica* di Valerio Flacco." *Aevum(ant)* 2: 231–242.

———. (2005). "Le fonti di Valerio Flacco nel libro I degli *Argonautica*." *GIF* 57: 131–155.

———. (2007a). *Valerii Flacci Argonautica I: Commento*. Berlin.

———. (2007b). "Valerio Flacco (*Argon*. I) e gli scolii ad Apollonio Rodio: Proposte." *Hermes* 135: 98–104.

———. (2010). "Argo di Tespie." *RFIC* 138: 143–154.

———. (2013). "*Recusatio* in Flavian Epic Poetry: Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* (1.7–20) and Statius' *Thebaid* (1.17–34)." In G. Manuwald and A. Voigt, eds. *Flavian Epic Interactions*, 55–66. Berlin.

Ganiban, R.T. (2007). *Statius and Virgil: The Thebaid and the Reinterpretation of the Aeneid*. Cambridge.

———. (2014). "The Beginnings of Statius' *Achilleid*." In W.J. Dominik and C. Newlands, eds. *Brill Companion to Statius*. Leiden.

Gantz, T. (1993). *Early Greek Myth: A Literary and Artistic Guide to the Sources*. Baltimore.

Garson, R.W. (1965). "Observations on Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* II." *CQ* 15: 104–120.

———. (1972). "Homeric Echoes in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*." *CPh* 67: 1–9.

Gärtner, T. (2008). "Der Epilog zur *Thebais* des Statius." *WJA* 32: 137–157.

Gärtner, U. (1994). *Gehalt und Funktion der Gleichnisse bei Valerius Flaccus*. Stuttgart.

Garulli, V. (2012). "Greek Acrostic Verse Inscriptions." In J. Kwapisz, D. Petrain, and M. Szymanski, eds. *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry*, 246–278. Berlin.

Gatz, B. (1967). *Weltalter, goldene Zeit und sinnverwandte Vorstellungen*. Hildesheim.

Georgacopoulou, S. (2005). *Aux frontières du récit épique: L'emploi de l'apostrophe du narrateur dans la Thébaide de Stace*. Brussels.

George, E.V. (1972). "Poet and Characters in Apollonius Rhodius' Lemnian Episode." *Hermes* 100: 47–63.

Gibson, B. (2004). "The Repetitions of Hypsipyle." In M. Gale, ed. *Latin Epic and Didactic Poetry: Genre, Tradition and Individuality*, 149–180. Swansea.

———. (2006). *Statius, Siluae 5*. Oxford.

———. (2010). "Silius Italicus: A Consular Historian?" In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, 47–72. Leiden.

Giomini, R. (1959). "Ricerche sulle due edizioni degli *Amores*." In *Atti del primo convegno internazionale ovidiano (Sulmona, Maggio 1958)*, 1.125–142. Rome.

Glei, R.F. (1999). "Margites." In H. Cancik, H. Schneider, and M. Landfester, eds. *Der Neue Pauly*, 7.885–886. Stuttgart.

Goodyear, F.R.D. ed. 1966. *Appendix Virgiliana*. Oxford.

Goold, G.P. trans. (1990). *Propertius: Elegies*. Cambridge, Mass.

Gow, A.S.F. (1917). "Miscellaneous Notes on the *Works and Days*," *CQ* 11: 113–118.

———. (1938). "The Thirteenth Idyll of Theocritus." *CQ* 32: 10–17.

Gow, A.S.F., and Page, D.L. (1965). *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols. Cambridge.

———. (1968). *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip*, 2 vols. Cambridge.

Gowers, E. (1993). *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*. Cambridge.

Graf, G. (1893). "Akrostichis." *RE* I: 1200–1207.

Gransden, K.W. (1976). *Virgil, Aeneid Book VIII*. Cambridge.

Grebe, S. (1989). *Die vergilische Heldenschau: Tradition und Fortwirken*. Frankfurt am Main.

Green, C.M.C. (1994). " 'The Necessary Murder': Myth, Ritual, and Civil War in Lucan, Book 3." *ClAnt* 13: 203–233.

———. (2010). "*Stimulos Dedit Aemula Virtus*: Lucan and Homer Reconsidered." In C. Tesoriero, ed. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Lucan*, 149–183. Oxford.

Green, P. trans. (1997). *The Argonautika by Apollonios Rhodios*. Berkeley.

Grenfell, B.P. and Hunt, A.S. eds. (1908). *The Oxyrhyncus Papyri VI 852*. London.

Grewing, F. (1997). *Martial, Buch VI: Ein Kommentar*. Göttingen.

———. (1999). "*Mundus inuersus*: Fiktion und Wirklichkeit in Martials Büchern XIII und XIV." *Prometheus* 25: 259–281.

Grimal, P. (1965). *Sénèque: Phèdre*. Paris.

Groß, A. (2003). *Prophezeiungen und Prodigien in den Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus*. Munich.

Gruppe, O. (1906). *Griechische Mythologie und Religiongeschichte*, 2 vols. Munich.

Gruzelier, C. (1994). "The Influence of Virgil's Dido on Statius' Portrayal of Hypsipyle." *Prudentia* 26: 153–165.

Gutzwiller, K. (1998). *Poetic Garlands. Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley.

Habinek, T. (2005). *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order*. Baltimore.

Hachtmann, C.E. (1865). *Dionysio Mytilenaeo seu Scytobrachione*. Bonn.

Hagopian, D. (1955). *Pollux Faustkampf mit Amykos: Theokrits Vorstellung von demselben verglichen mit derjenigen des Apollonios*. Vienna.

Hall, J.B., Ritchie, A.L., and Edwards, M.J. eds. (2007). *P. Papinius Statius. Volume I, Thebaid and Achilleid*. Newcastle.

Hallett, J.P. (1996). "*Nec castrare uelis meos libellos*: Sexual and Poetic *Lusus* in Catullus, Martial and the *Carmina Priapea*." In C. Klodt, ed. *Satura Lanx: Festschrift W.A. Krenkel*, 321–344. Hildesheim.

Hanses, M. (forthcoming). "The Pun and the Moon in the Sky: Aratus' ΛΕΠΤΗ Acrostic." *CQ*.

Happle, E.M. 1957. *Die drei ersten Fahrtenepisoden in den Argonautika des Apollonios Rhodios und Valerius Flaccus*. Diss. University of Freiburg.

Harder, A. ed. (2012). *Callimachus: Aetia*, 2 vols. Oxford.

Hardie, A. (1983). *Statius and the Siluae: Poets, Patrons and Epideixis in the Graeco-Roman World*. Liverpool.
———. (2010). "Canens (Ovid *Metamorphoses* 14.320–434)." *SIFC* 8: 11–67.
Hardie, P.R. (1989). "Flavian Epicists on Virgil's Epic Technique." *Ramus* 18: 3–20.
———. (1992). "Augustan Poets and the Mutability of Rome." In A. Powell, ed. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, 59–82. London.
———. (1993). *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge.
———. (1994). *Virgil: Aeneid Book IX*. Cambridge.
———. (1997). "Virgil and Tragedy." In C. Martindale, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, 312–326. Cambridge.
———. (1998). *Virgil*. Oxford.
———. (2004). "In the Steps of the Sibyl: Tradition and Desire in the Epic Underworld." *MD* 52: 143–156.
Harmand, R. (1898). *De Valerio Flacco Apollonii Rhodii Imitatore*. Nantes.
Harris, W. (2009). *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge.
Harrison, E.L. (1979). "The Noric Plague in Vergil's Third *Georgic*." *PLLS* 2: 1–65.
Harrison, S.J. (2007). "The Primal Voyage and the Ocean of Epos: Two Aspects of Metapoetic Imagery in Catullus, Virgil and Horace." *Dictynna* 4: 1–17.
———. (2010). "Picturing the Future Again: Proleptic Ekphrasis in Silius' *Punica*." In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, 279–292. Leiden.
Hartung, J.A. (1844). *Euripides restitutus*. Hamburg.
Harz, C. (2007). *Catulls Epigramme im Kontext hellenistischer Dichtung*. Berlin.
Hawkins, S. (2011). "Catullus' Furius." *CPh* 106: 254–260.
Heck, E. (1970). "Scipio am Scheideweg. Die *Punica* des Silius Italicus und Ciceros Schrift *De re publica*." *WS* 83: 159–177.
Heinrich, A.J. (1999). "*Longa retro series*: Sacrifice and Repetition in Statius' Menoeceus Episode." *Arethusa* 32: 165–195.
Heinze, R. (1915³). *Virgils epische Technik*. Leipzig.
Heller, A. and Pont, A-V. eds. (2012). *Patrie d'origine et patries électives: Les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d'époque romaine. Actes du colloque international de Tours, 6–7 novembre 2009*. Bordeaux.
Helm, R. (1892). *De P. Papinii Statii Thebaide*. Berlin.
———. (1955). "M. Valerius Martialis." *RE* VIII.A.1: 55–85.
Henderson, J. (2001). "On Pliny on Martial on Anon … (*Epistles* 3.21 / *Epigrams* 10.19)." *Ramus* 30: 56–87.
Henriksén, C. (2012). *A Commentary on Martial, Epigrams Book 9*. Oxford.
Hentze, C. (1905). "Die Chorreden in den homerischen Epen." *Philologus* 64: 254–268.
Hershkowitz, D. (1997). "*Parce metu, Cytherea*: 'Failed' Intertext Repetition in Statius' *Thebaid*, or, Don't Stop Me If You've Heard This One Before." *MD* 39: 35–52.
———. (1998). *Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica: Abbreviated Voyages in Silver Latin Epic*. Oxford.
Herter, H. (1944–1955). "Bericht über die Literatur zur hellenistischen Dichtung seit dem Jahre 1921. 2. Teil: Apollonios von Rhodos." In *Bursian's Jahresbericht* 285, 213–410.

Van Herwerden, H. ed. (1909). *Euripidis Hypsipylae fragmenta post Grenfellium et Huntium*. Utrecht.
Heslin, P.J. (2005). *The Transvestite Achilles: Gender and Genre in Statius' Achilleid*. Cambridge.
———. (2008). "Statius and the Greek Tragedians on Athens, Thebes and Rome." In J.J.L. Smolenaars, H.-J. van Dam, and R.R. Nauta, eds. *The Poetry of Statius*, 111–128. Leiden.
Heyne, G. (1893). *De fontibus et auctoribus historiarum Diodori*. [n. p.].
Heyworth, S. (1994). "Some Allusions to Callimachus in Latin Poetry." *MD* 33: 51–79.
Hilberg, I. (1899). "Ist die *Ilias Latina* von einem Italicus verfasst oder einem Italicus gewidmet?" *WS* 21: 264–305.
Hill, D.E. ed. (1996[2]). *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos libri XII*. Leiden.
Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
———. (2000). "Essential Epic: Genre and Gender from Macer to Statius." In M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, 221–241. Cambridge, Mass.
———. (2007). "Martial's Ovid / Ovid's Martial." *JRS* 97: 113–154.
Holford-Strevens, L. (2000). "In Search of Poplios Papinios Statios." *Hermathena* 168: 39–54.
Hollis, A.S. (1970). *Ovid, Metamorphoses Book VIII*. Oxford.
———. (2007). "Some Poetic Connections of Lycophron's *Alexandra*." In P.J. Finglass, C. Collard, and N.J. Richardson, eds. *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M.L. West on his Seventieth Birthday*, 276–293. Oxford.
Holzberg, N. (1988). *Martial*. Heidelberg.
———. (1997). *Ovid: Dichter und Werk*. Munich.
———. (2002a). *Catull: Der Dichter und sein erotisches Werk*. Munich.
———. (2002b). *Martial und das antike Epigramm*. Darmstadt.
———. (2002c). *Ovid: The Poet and his Work*. Ithaca, NY.
———. (2004–2005). "Martial, the Book, and Ovid." *Hermathena* 177–178: 209–224.
———. (2006). "Playing with his Life: Ovid's 'Autobiographical' References." In P. Knox, ed. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Ovid*, 51–68. Oxford.
———. (2009). *Horaz: Dichter und Werk*. Munich.
Horsfall, N. (1971). "Numanus Remulus: Ethnography and Propaganda in *Aeneid* 9.598 ff." *Latomus* 30: 1108–1116.
———. (1973–1974). "Dido in the Light of History." *PVS* 13: 1–13.
———. (2000). *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary*. Leiden.
Höschele, R. (2006). *Verrückt nach Frauen: Der Epigrammatiker Rufin*. Tübingen.
———. (2013). "*Sit pudor et finis*: False Closure in Ancient Epigram." In F.F. Grewing, B. Acosta-Hughes, and A. Kirichenko, eds. *The Door Ajar: False Closure in Greek and Roman Literature and Art*, 247–262. Heidelberg.
Housman, A.E. (1907). "Corrections and Explanations of Martial." *JPh* 30: 229–265.
Howell, P. (1980). *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial*. London.
———. (1998). "Martial's Return to Spain." In F. Grewing, ed. *Toto notus in orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation*, 173–186. Stuttgart.
———. (2009). *Martial*. London.
Hughes, J. (1984). "Group Speech Acts." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 7.4: 379–395.

Hunter, R.L. (1986). "Apollo and the Argonauts: Two Notes on Ap. Rhod. 2.669–719." *MH* 43: 50–60.

———. (1988). "'Short on Heroics': Jason in the *Argonautica*". *CQ* 28: 436–453.

———. (1989). *Apollonius of Rhodes: Argonautika III*. Cambridge.

———. (1991). "Greek and Non-Greek in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius." In S. Said, ed. ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ: *Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*, 81–99. Leiden.

———. (1993). *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies*. Cambridge.

———. (2006). *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome*. Cambridge.

Hurst, A. (1967). *Apollonios de Rhodes: Manière et cohérence. Contribution à l'étude de l'esthétique alexandrine*. Rome.

Hutchinson, G. (1988). *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford.

———. (1993). *Latin Literature from Seneca to Juvenal: A Critical Study*. Oxford.

———. (2006). *Propertius: Elegies, Book IV*. Cambridge.

Ibscher, R. (1939). *Gestalt der Szene und Form der Rede in den Argonautika des Apollonios Rhodios*. Diss. University of Munich.

Immisch, O. (1911). "Zu Martial." *Hermes* 46: 481–517.

Italie, G. (1923). *Euripidis Hypsipyla cum notis criticis et exegeticis*. Berlin.

Jackson, G. (1996). "*Iners*." In *Virgilio: Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, 2.952. Rome.

Jackson, S. (1997). "Argo: The First Ship?" *RhM* 140: 249–257.

———. (2003). "Apollonius of Rhodes: Death on Tenos." *QUCC* 73 121–127.

Jacobson, H. (1974). *Ovid's Heroides*. Princeton.

Jacques, J.-M. (1960). "Sur un acrostiche d'Aratos (*Phén*., 783–787)." *REA* 62: 48–61.

Jal, P. (1963). *La guerre civile à Rome: Étude littéraire et morale*. Paris.

Johnson, W.R. (1976). *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*. Berkeley.

———. (1994). "Information and Form: Homer, Achilles and Statius." In S.M. Oberhelman, V. Kelly, and R.J. Golsan, eds. *Epic and Epoch: Essays on the Interpretation and History of a Genre*, 25–39. Lubbock.

Jones, B.W. (1992). *The Emperor Domitian*. London.

Juhnke, H. (1972). *Homerisches in römischer Epik flavischer Zeit: Untersuchungen zu Szenennachbildungen und Strukturentsprechungen in Statius' Thebais und Achilleis und in Silius' Punica*. Munich.

Kannicht, R. ed. (2004). *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Volume 5: Euripides*. Göttingen.

Karanika, A. (2011). "Odysseus, Heracles, and the Gorgon in the Underworld." *Arethusa* 44: 1–27.

Kaster, R.A. (1995). *C. Suetonius Tranquillus: De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*. Oxford.

Katz, J.T. (2008). "Vergil Translates Aratus: *Phaenomena* 1–2 and *Georgics* 1.1–2." *MD* 60: 105–123.

———. (2012). "The Muse at Play: An Introduction." In J. Kwapisz, D. Petrain, and M. Szymanski, eds. *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry*, 1–30. Berlin.

Kay, N.M. (1985). *Martial, Book XI: A Commentary*. London.

Kerkhecker, A. (1999). *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*. Oxford.

Kershaw, A. (1997). "Martial 9.44 and Statius." *CPh* 92: 269–272.

Kessels, A.H.M. (1978). *Studies on the Dream in Greek Literature*. Utrecht.

Keyes, C.W. trans. (1928). *Cicero: De re publica, De legibus*. Cambridge, Mass.
Kidd, D. ed. (1997). *Aratus: Phaenomena*. Cambridge.
King, J.E. trans. (1950). *Cicero: Tusculan Disputations*. Cambridge, Mass.
Kirk, G.S. ed. (1985). *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume I: Books 1–4*. Cambridge.
Kißel, W. (1979). *Das Geschichtsbild des Silius Italicus*. Frankfurt am Main.
Klaassen, E.K. (2010). "Imitation and the Hero." In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, 99–126. Leiden.
Kleywegt, A.J. (2005). *Valerius Flaccus Argonautica Book I: A Commentary*. Leiden.
Knauer, G.N. (1964). *Die Aeneis und Homer: Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis*. Göttingen.
Knight, V.H. (1995). *The Renewal of Epic: Responses to Homer in the Argonautica of Apollonius*. Leiden.
Knox, P.E. (1985). "Wine, Water, and Callimachean Polemics." *HSPh* 89: 107–119.
———. (2006). "An Unnoticed Imitation of Callimachus, *Aetia* Fr. 1.1 Pf." *CQ* 56: 639–640.
Köhnken, A. 1965. *Apollonios Rhodios und Theokrit: Die Hylas- und die Amykosgeschichten beider Dichter und die Frage der Priorität*. Göttingen.
Korenjak, M. (2000). "Die Hesperiden als Okeanos-Enkelinnen: Eine Unnötige Crux bei Apollonios Rhodios." *Hermes* 128: 240–242.
Korn, M. (1989). *Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica 4.1–343: Ein Kommentar*. Hildesheim.
Kovacs, D. trans. (1994–2002). *Euripides*, 6 vols. Cambridge, Mass.
Krasne, D. (2011). *Mythic Recursions: Doubling and Variation in the Mythological Works of Ovid and Valerius Flaccus*. Diss. University of California at Berkeley.
———. (forthcoming). "Where Have All the Aetia Gone? Aetiological Reassignment in Valerius Flaccus's *Argonautica*." In C. Reitz and A. Walter, eds. *Telling Origins / Dichtung und Ursache*. Hildesheim.
Krevans, N. (1993). "Fighting against Antimachus: The *Lyde* and the *Aetia* Reconsidered." In A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker, eds. *Callimachus*, 149–160. Groningen.
———. (2000). "On the Margins of Epic: The Foundation-poems of Apollonius." In A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker, eds. *Hellenistica Groningana 4. Papers of the Groningen Workshop on Hellenistic Poetry 4: Apollonius Rhodius* (*Groningen, 2–4 Sept. 1998*), 69–84. Leuven.
Kronenberg, L. (2009). *Allegories of Farming from Greece and Rome: Philosophical Satire in Xenophon, Varro, and Virgil*. Cambridge.
Kruuse, J. (1941). "L'originalité artistique de Martial: Son style, sa composition, sa technique." *C&M* 4: 248–300.
Kuchenmüller, W.E. (1928). *Philetae Coi Reliquiae*. Berlin.
Kulcsár, P. ed. (1987). *Mythographi Vaticani I et II*. Turnhout.
Kyriakou, P. (1995). "Κατάβασις and the Underworld in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius." *Philologus* 139: 256–264.
Laird, A. (1992). *Modes of Reporting Speech in Latin Fictional Narrative*. Diss. Oxford University.
Landrey, L. (2012). *Valerius Flaccus' Roman Epic*. Diss. Brown University.
———. (forthcoming). "Audacity Afloat: Elite Ambition and Imperial Intolerance." In L. Fratantuono and C. Stark, eds. *A Companion to Latin Epic, 14–96 CE*. Malden, Mass.

Langen, P. (1896–1897). *C. Valeri Flacci Setini Balbi Argonauticon libri octo*. Berlin.
Lapidge, M. (1979). "Lucan's Imagery of Cosmic Dissolution." *Hermes* 107: 344–370.
Laurens, P. (1965). "Martial et l'epigramme grecque du 1er siècle ap. J.C." *REL* 43: 315–341.
———. (1989). *L'abeille dans l'ambre: Célébration de l'épigramme de l'époque alexandrine à la fin de la Renaissance*. Paris.
———. (1992). "La poétique de la langue ou la performance descriptive dans le livre VI de l'*Anthologie Grecque* et dans les livres XIII et XIV de Martial." *RPh* 65: 301–315.
Lausberg, M. (1982). *Das Einzeldistichon: Studien zum antiken Epigramm*. Munich.
———. (1984). "Martials Spottepigramm auf den winzigen Bauern (11, 14)." *RhM* 127: 159–165.
Lavigne, D. (2008). "Embodied Poetics in Martial 11." *TAPhA* 138: 275–311.
Leary, T.J. (1996). *Martial, Book XIV: The Apophoreta*. London.
Le Bas, P. and Waddington, D.A. (1870). *Inscriptions grecques et latines recueillies en Asie Mineur*. Paris.
Lee, G. trans. (1990). *The Poems of Catullus*. Oxford.
Lee, M.O. (1979). *Fathers and Sons in Virgil's Aeneid*: *Tum Genitor Natum*. Albany, NY.
Legras, L. (1905). *Étude sur la Thébaïde de Stace*. Paris.
Leigh, M. (2010). "Boxing and Sacrifice: Apollonius, Vergil, and Valerius." *HSPh* 105: 117–155.
Lemaire, N.E. ed. (1824). *Valerii Flacci Setini Balbi Argonauticon*. Paris.
Lenz, F.W. (1965). *Die Liebeselegien*. Darmstadt.
Lesher, J.H. (1992). *Xenophanes of Colophon: Fragments. A Text and Translation with a Commentary*. Toronto.
Lesueur, R. (1978). "L' épisode de Phinée dans les *Argonautiques* de Valérius Flaccus." *Pallas* 25: 41–58.
———. trans. (1990). *Stace, Thébaide I–IV*. Paris.
Levi, M.A. (1975). "I Flavi." *ANRW* 2.2: 177–207.
Levin, D.N. (1971). *Apollonius' Argonautica Re-examined* [*I*]*: The Neglected First and Second Books*. Leiden.
Lewis, W.L. trans. (1773). *The Thebaid of Statius*. London.
Liberman, G. ed. (1997). *Valerius Flaccus: Argonautiques. Chants I–IV*. Paris.
———. ed. (2002). *Valerius Flaccus: Argonautiques. Chants V–VIII*. Paris.
Lindsay, W.M. (1929^2). *M. Val. Martialis Epigrammata*. Oxford.
Littlewood, C. (2008). "Gender and Power in Seneca's *Thyestes*." In J. Fitch, ed. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Seneca*, 244–263. Oxford.
Littlewood, R.J. (2011). *A Commentary on Silius Italicus' Punica 7*. Oxford.
———. (2013a). "Patterns of Darkness: Chthonic Illusion, Gigantomachy, and Sacrificial Ritual in the *Punica*." In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*, 199–215. Oxford.
———. (2013b). "*Inuida fata piis*? Exploring the Significance of Silius' Divergence from the Night Raids of Virgil and Statius." In G. Manuwald and A. Voigt, eds. *Flavian Epic Interactions*, 279–296. Berlin.
Livingstone, N. and Nisbet, G. (2010). *Epigram*. Cambridge.
Livrea, E. (1973). *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautikon liber IV*. Florence.
Lloyd-Jones, H. trans. (1994–1996). *Sophocles*, 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.

Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P.J. eds. (1981). *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin.
Lóio, A.M. (2012). "Commemorating Events: The *Victoria Sosibii* in Statius' *Siluae* 4.3." *CQ* 62: 281–285.
Lorenz, S. (2002). *Erotik und Panegyrik: Martials epigrammatische Kaiser*. Tübingen.
———. (2003). "Martial: 1970–2003. 1. Teil." *Lustrum* 45: 167–277.
———. (2007). "Catullus and Martial." In M.B. Skinner, ed. *A Companion to Catullus*, 418–438. Malden, Mass.
Lossau, M. (1980). "Elpenor und Palinurus." *WS* 14: 102–124.
Lovatt, H. (2005). *Statius and Epic Games: Sport, Politics and Poetics in the Thebaid*. Cambridge.
———. (2007). "Statius, Orpheus, and the Post-Augustan Vates." *Arethusa* 40: 145–163.
———. (2010). "Interplay: Silius and Statius in the Games of *Punica* 16." In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, 155–178. Leiden.
Lovejoy, A. and Boas, G. (1935) *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*. Baltimore.
Luck, G. (1961). *Die Römische Liebeselegie*. Heidelberg.
Lüthje, E. (1971). *Gehalt und Aufriss der Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus*. Kiel.
Luz, C. (2010). *Technopaignia: Formspiele in der griechischen Dichtung*. Leiden.
Mairs, R. (2012). "*Sopha grammata*: Acrostichs in Greek and Latin Inscriptions from Arachosia, Nubia and Libya." In J. Kwapisz, D. Petrain, and M. Szymanski, eds. *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry*, 279–306. Berlin.
Malamud, M.A. and McGuire, D.T. Jr. (1993). "Flavian Variant: Myth. Valerius' *Argonautica*." In A.J. Boyle, ed. *Roman Epic*, 192–217. London.
Männlein-Robert, I. (2007). *Stimme, Schrift und Bild: Zum Verhältnis der Künste in der hellenistischen Dichtung*. Heidelberg.
Manolaraki, E. (2012). *Noscendi Nilum Cupido: Imagining the Nile from Lucan to Philostratus*. Berlin.
Manuwald, G. (1999). *Die Cyzicus-Episode und ihre Funktion in den Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus*. Göttingen.
———. (2000). "Der Tod der Eltern Jasons." *Philologus* 144: 325–338.
———. (2007). "Epic Poets as Characters: On Poetics and Multiple Intertextuality in Silius Italicus' *Punica*." *RFIC* 135: 71–90.
———. (2008). "Phrixus, a Refugee from Greece in Asia: His Role in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*". In L. Castagna and C. Riboldi, eds. *Amicitiae templa serena: Studi in onore di Giuseppe Aricò*, 2.987–1010. Milan.
———. (2009). "What Do Humans Get to Know About the Gods and their Plans? On Prophecies and their Deficiencies in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*." *Mnemosyne* 62: 586–608.
Manzo, A. (1995). "La fonte greca degli epigrammi sepolcrali di Marziale." In L. Belloni, G. Milanese, and A. Porro, eds. *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata*, 1.755–768. Milan.
Mariotta, G. and Magnelli, A. (2012). *Diodoro Siculo, Biblioteca Storica libro IV*. Milan.
Marks, R.D. (2005). *From Republic to Empire: Scipio Africanus in the Punica of Silius Italicus*. Frankfurt am Main.
———. (2008). "Getting Ahead: Decapitation as Political Metaphor in Silius Italicus' *Punica*." *Mnemosyne* 61: 66–88.
———. (2010a). "Silius and Lucan." In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, 127–153. Leiden.

———. (2010b). "Lucan's Curio in the *Punica*." In F. Schaffenrath, ed. *Silius Italicus. Akten der Innsbrucker Tagung vom 19.–21. Juni 2008*, 29–46. Frankfurt am Main.
———. (2010c). "The Song and the Sword: Silius' *Punica* and the Crisis of Early Imperial Epic." In D. Kostan and K.A. Raaflaub, eds. *Epic and History*, 185–211. Malden, Mass.
Markus, D.D. (1997). "Transfiguring Heroism: Nisus and Euryalus in Statius' *Thebaid*." *Vergilius* 43: 56–62.
———. (2000). "Performing the Book: The Recital of Epic in First-Century C.E. Rome." *ClAnt* 19: 138–179.
———. (2003). "The Politics of Epic Performance in Statius." In A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik, eds. *Flavian Rome. Culture, Image, Text*, 431–467. Leiden.
Marsilio, M.S. and Podlesney, K. (2006). "Poverty and Poetic Rivalry in Catullus (C. 23, 13, 16, 24, 81)." *AClass* 49: 167–181.
Martin, Jean. trans. (1998). *Aratos: Phénomènes*, 2 vols. Paris.
Martin, Joseph. ed. (1969). *T. Lucretius Carus, De rerum natura*. Leipsig.
Martini, E. (1933). *Einleitung zu Ovid*. Brünn.
Masters, J. (1992). *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Ciuile*. Cambridge.
Matthews, V.J. (1996). *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary*. Leiden.
Mattiacci, S. (2007). "Marziale e il neoterismo." In A. Bonadeo and E. Romano, eds. *Dialogando con il Passato: Permanenze e innovazioni nella cultura latina di età flavia*, 177–206. Florence.
Mattiacci, S. and Perruccio, A. (2007). *Anti-mitologia ed eredità neoterica in Marziale: Genesi e forme di una poetica*. Pisa.
Mattingly, H. and Sydenham, A.E. (1926). *The Roman Imperial Coinage II*. London.
Mauri, R. (1999). *Saggio di commento a Stazio: Tebaide V 1–497*. Diss. University of Bologna.
McConnell, S. (2012). "Cicero and Dicaearchus." *OSAPh* 42: 307–349.
McCrum, M. and Woodhead, A.G. (1961). *Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperors*. Cambridge.
McGuire, D.T., Jr. (1997). *Acts of Silence: Civil War, Tyranny, and Suicide in the Flavian Epics*. Hildesheim.
McKay, K.J. (1978). "A Lost Work of Philitas?" *Antichthon* 12: 36–44.
McKeown, J.C. (1987). *Ovid, Amores. Vol. I: Text and Prolegomena*. Liverpool.
———. (1989). *Ovid, Amores. Vol. II: A Commentary on Book I*. Liverpool.
McNelis, C. (2002). "Greek Grammarians and Roman Society under the Early Empire." *ClAnt* 21: 67–94.
———. (2007). *Statius' Thebaid and the Poetics of Civil War*. Cambridge.
———. (2008). "*Vt sculptura poesis*: Statius, Martial, and the Hercules *Epitrapezios* of Novius Vindex." *AJPh* 129: 255–276.
Mehmel, F. (1934). *Valerius Flaccus*. Diss. University of Hamburg.
Mette H.J. (1961). "*genus tenue* und *mensa tenuis* bei Horaz." *MH* 18: 136–139.
Meyer, D. (2005). *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen: Das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos*. Stuttgart.
———. (2007). "The Act of Reading and the Act of Writing in Hellenistic Epigram." In P. Bing and J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, 187–210. Leiden.

Micozzi, L. (2009). "*Ille referre aliter saepe solebat idem*: Ripetizione e sperimentalismo narrativo nella *Tebaide* di Stazio." *MD* 61: 211–227.
Miller, F.J. and Goold, G.P. trans. (1977). *Ovid: Metamorphoses*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.
Mindt, N. (forthcoming). *Martials epigrammatischer Kanon*. Munich.
Morelli, A.M. (2008). "*Epigramma longum*: In cerca di una *básanos* per il genere epigrammatico." In A.M. Morelli, ed. *Epigramma longum: Da Marziale alla tarda antichità. Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 29–31 maggio 2006*, 17–51. Cassino.
Moreno Soldevila, R. (2004–2005). "Introducción." In J. Fernández Valverde and E. Montero Cartelle, eds. *Marco Valerio Marcial: Epigramas*, ix–cxxix. Madrid.
———. (2006). *Martial, Book IV: A Commentary*. Leiden.
Morgan, G. (1993). "*Nullam, Vare* … Chance or Choice in *Odes* 1.18?" *Philologus* 137: 142–145.
Morgan, L. (1998). "Assimilation and Civil War: Hercules and Cacus (*Aen.* 8.185–267)." In H-P. Stahl, ed. *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context*, 175–197. London.
———. (2010). *Musa Pedestris: Metre and Meaning in Roman Verse*. Oxford.
Mori, A. (2008). *The Politics of Apollonius Rhodius' Argonautica*. Cambridge.
Morwood, J. trans. (2007). *Euripides: Suppliant Women*. Warminster.
Moya, F. (1996). "Sonno." In *Virgilio: Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, 4.940–941. Rome.
Mozley, J.H. trans. (1936). *Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica*. Cambridge, Mass.
Mulder, H.M. (1954). *Publii Papinii Statii Thebaidos liber secundus, commentario exegetico aestheticoque instructus*. Groningen.
Müller, C. (1842). *Diodori Siculi Bibliothecae Historicae quae supersunt*. Paris.
Müller, L. (1856). "De Ovidi Amorum libris." *Philologus* 11: 60–91.
Muñoz Jiménez, M.J. (1996). "Los *Apophoreta* 183–196 de Marcial y la recepción del texto en el s. I d. C." In A.M. Aldama Roy, ed. *De Roma al siglo XX*, 1, 391–397. Madrid.
Murgatroyd, P. (2009). *A Commentary on Book 4 of Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica*. Leiden.
Murgia, C. (1986). "The Date of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* 3." *AJPh* 107: 74–94.
Murray, A.T. and Dimock, G.E. trans. (1995). *Homer: Odyssey*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.
Murray, A.T. and Wyatt, W.F. trans. (1999). *Homer: Iliad*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.
Murray, J. (2005). "The Constructions of the Argo in Apollonius' *Argonautica*." *Caeculus* 6: 88–106.
Mynors, R.A.B. ed. (1969). *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford.
———. (1994). *Virgil: Georgics*. Oxford.
Nappa, C. (2005). *Reading after Actium: Vergil's Georgics, Octavian, and Rome*. Ann Arbor.
Narducci, E. (1992). *Cicerone: Il poeta Archia*. Milan.
Natanblut, E. (2009). "Amphion in Euripides' *Antiope*." *RhM* 152: 133–140.
Nauta, R.R. (2002). *Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian*. Leiden.
———. (2006). "The *Recusatio* in Flavian Poetry." In R.R. Nauta, H.-J. van Dam, and J.J.L. Smolenaars, eds. *Flavian Poetry*, 21–40. Leiden.

Neger, M. (2012). *Martials Dichtergedichte: Das Epigramm als Medium der poetischen Selbstreflexion*. Tübingen.

Nelis, D. (1991). "Iphias: Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica* 1, 311–316." *CQ* 41: 96–105.

———. (2001). *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Leeds.

Newlands, C. (1991). "*Siluae* 3.1 and Statius' Poetic Temple." *CQ* 41: 438–452.

———. (2002). *Statius' Silvae and the Poetics of Empire*. Cambridge.

———. (2009). "Statius' Prose Prefaces." *MD* 61: 229–242.

———. (2011). *Statius: Siluae Book II*. Cambridge.

———. (2012). *Statius, Poet between Rome and Naples*. London.

Newman, J.K. (1967). *Augustus and the New Poetry*. Brussels.

———. (1986). *The Classical Epic Tradition*. Madison, WI.

———. (1989). "Later Latin Poetry: Some Principles of Interpretation." *ICS* 14: 243–263.

———. (1990). *Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility*. Hildesheim.

Van Nijf, O. (2012). "Athletes, Artists and Citizens in the Imperial Greek City." In A. Heller and A-V. Pont, eds. *Patrie d'origine et patries électives: Les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d'époque romaine. Actes du colloque international de Tours, 6–7 novembre 2009*, 175–194. Bordeaux.

Nisbet, G. (2003). *Greek Epigram in the Roman Empire: Martial's Forgotten Rivals*. Oxford.

———. (2007). "Roman Imperial Receptions of Hellenistic Epigram." In P. Bing and J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, 543–563. Leiden.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and Hubbard, M. (1970). *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book 1*. Oxford.

Nisetich, F. trans. (2001). *The Poems of Callimachus*. Oxford.

Nishimura-Jensen, J. (1998). "The Poetics of Aethalides: Silence and *poikilia* in Apollonius' *Argonautica*." *CQ* 48: 456–469.

———. (2009). "The Chorus of Argonauts in Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica*." *Phoenix* 63: 1–23.

Norden, E. (1926³). *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI*. Berlin.

Nugent, S.G. (1996). "Statius' Hypsipyle: Following in the Footsteps of the *Aeneid*." *Scholia* 5: 46–71.

Nuzzo, G. ed. (2012). *Publio Papinio Stazio: Achilleide*. Palermo.

Obermayer, H.P. (1998). *Martial und der Diskurs über männliche "Homosexualität" in der Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit*. Tübingen.

O'Bryhim, S. (2007). "Catullus 23 as Roman Comedy." *TAPhA* 137: 133–145.

Occioni, O. (1871). *Cajo Silio Italico e il suo poema: Studi*. Florence.

O'Connor, E. (1990). "Mamurianus and Martial's Revenge (*Epigrams* I.92)." *CB* 66: 93–95.

O'Hara, J.J. (2007). *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan*. Cambridge.

Oldfather, C.H. trans. (1935). *Diodorus of Sicily II: Books 2.35–4.58*. Cambridge, Mass.

Oliver, R. (1945). "The First Edition of the *Amores*." *TAPhA* 76: 191–215.

Olivieri, O. (2011). *Miti e culti tebani nella poesia di Pindaro*. Pisa.

Pache, C.O. (2004). *Baby and Child Heroes in Ancient Greece*. Urbana, Ill.

Panoussi, V. (2009). *Greek Tragedy in Vergil's Aeneid: Ritual, Empire, and Intertext*. Cambridge.

Papanghelis, T.D. (1991). "Catullus and Callimachus on Large Women (A Reconsideration of *C.* 86)." *Mnemosyne* 44: 372–386.

Parkes, R. (2012). *Statius, Thebaid 4*. Oxford.

Paton, W.R. trans. (1916–1918). *The Greek Anthology*, 5 vols. Cambridge, Mass.

Pavlock, B. (2009). *The Image of the Poet in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Madison, WI.

Pease, A.S. (1968). *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Natura Deorum libri III*. Darmstadt.

Peek, P.S. (2002). "Feeding Aurelius' Hunger: Catullus 21." *AClass* 45: 89–99.

Pepin, R.E. trans. (2008). *The Vatican Mythographers*. New York.

Pertsch, E. (1911). *De Valerio Martiale Graecorum poetarum imitatore*. Diss. University of Berlin.

Perutelli, A. (1997). *C. Valeri Flacci Argonauticon liber VII*. Florence.

Pfeiffer, R. ed. (1949–1953). *Callimachus*, 2 vols. Oxford.

Pini, L. (2006). "Omero, Menandro e i 'classici' latini negli *Apophoreta* di Marziale: Criteri di selezione e ordinamento." *RFIC* 134: 443–478.

Pitcher R.A. (1982). "*Passer Catulli*: The Evidence of Martial." *Antichthon* 16: 97–103.

———. (1998). "Martial's Debt to Ovid." In F. Grewing, ed. *Toto notus in orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation*, 59–76. Stuttgart.

Polleichtner, W. (2005). *Aeneas' Emotions in Vergil's Aeneid and their Literary and Philosophical Foundations: An Analysis of Select Scenes*. Diss. University of Texas at Austin.

Pontani, F. (1999). "The First Word of Callimachus' *Aitia*." *ZPE* 128: 57–59.

Poortvliet, H.M. (1991). *C. Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica Book II: A Commentary*. Amsterdam.

Powell, J.G.F. ed. (2006). *M. Tulli Ciceronis De re publica, De legibus, Cato Maior de senectute, Laelius de amicitia*. Oxford.

Pretagostini, R. (2007). "Vita e poetica negli *epigrammi* 1 e 28 Pf. di Callimaco." In G. Lozza and S. Martinelli Tempesta, eds. *L'epigramma greco: Problemi e prospettive*, 137–147. Milan.

Prinz, K. (1911). *Martial und die griechische Epigrammatik*. Vienna.

Privitera, G.A. ed. (1982). *Pindaro: Le Istmiche*. Milan.

Puelma, M. (1996). "ἐπίγραμμα–*epigramma*: Aspekte einer Wortgeschichte." *MH* 53: 123–139.

Putnam, M.C.J. (1970). "*Aeneid* VII and the *Aeneid*." *AJPh* 91: 408–430.

Quinn, K. (1968). *Virgil's Aeneid: A Critical Description*. London.

Race, W.H. trans. (1997). *Pindar: Nemean Odes, Pythian Odes, Fragments*. Cambridge, Mass.

———. trans. (2008). *Apollonius Rhodius: Argonautica*. Cambridge, Mass.

Ramachandran, A. (2007). "Tasso's Petrarch: The Lyric Means to Epic Ends." *MLN* 122: 186–208.

Reitz, C. (1982). *Die Nekyia in den Punica des Silius Italicus*. Frankfurt am Main.

Reitzenstein, R. (1893). *Epigramm und Skolion*. Giessen.

———. (1935). "Das neue Kunstwollen in den *Amores* Ovids." *RhM* 84: 62–88.

Reussner, A. (1921). *De Statio et Euripide*. Diss. Halle University.

Reynolds, J.D. ed. (1977). *L. Annaei Senecae Dialogorum libri duodecim*. Oxford.

Ribbeck, O. (1892). *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung. III: Dichtung der Kaiserherrschaft*. Stuttgart.

Richardson, L. Jr. (1963). "*Furi et Aureli Comites Catulli*." *CPh* 58: 93–106.

Rimell, V. (2005). *Martial's Rome: Empire and the Ideology of Epigram*. Cambridge.

Río Torres-Murciano, A. (2005). "El proemio de Valerio Flaco: Una lectura rétorica." *CFC*(*L*) 25: 79–100.

Ripoll, F. (1998). *La morale héroïque dans les épopées latines d'époque flavienne: Tradition et innovation*. Leuven.

———. (1999). "Aspects et fonction de Néron dans la propagande impériale flavienne." In J.-M. Croisille, R. Martin, and Y. Perrin, eds. *Neronia V. Néron: Histoire et légende. Actes du Ve colloque international de la Société Internationale d'Études Néroniennes* (*Clermont-Ferrand et Saint-Étienne, 2–6 novembre 1994*), 137–151. Brussels.

———. (2000). "Silius Italicus et Cicéron." *LEC* 68.2–3: 147–173.

———. (2001). "Le monde homérique dans les *Punica* de Silius Italicus." *Latomus* 60: 87–107.

———. (2003). "Vieillesse et héroïsme dans les épopées flaviennes: Silius Italicus et Valérius Flaccus." In B. Bakhouche, ed. *L'ancienneté chez les anciens. Tome II: Mythologie et religion*, 653–676. Montpellier.

Ripoll, F. and Soubiran, J. (2008). *Stace: Achilléide*. Leuven.

Robert, L. (1981). "Une épigramme satirique d'Automédon et Athènes au début de l'empire: *Anthologie Palatine* XI 319." *REG* 94: 338–361.

Roberts C.H. and Skeat, T.C. (1983). *The Birth of the Codex*. London.

Rocca-Serra, G. (1990). "*Imitatio Alexandri* et stoïcisme: Manilius et Silius Italicus." In J-M. Croisille, ed. *Neronia IV: Alejandro Magno, modelo de los imperatores romanos*, 379–387. Brussels.

Roche, P. (2009). *Lucan, De Bello Civili Book 1*. Oxford.

Roman, L. (2001). "The Representation of Literary Materiality in Martial's *Epigrams*." *JRS* 91: 113–145.

Rosati, G. (1992). "L'*Achilleide* di Stazio, un epica dell'ambiguitá." *Maia* 44: 233–266.

———. (2008). "Statius, Domitian and Acknowledging Paternity. Rituals of Succession in the *Thebaid*." In J.J.L. Smolenaars, H.-J. van Dam, and R.R. Nauta, eds. *The Poetry of Statius*, 176–193. Leiden.

———. (2011). "I tria corda di Stazio, poeta greco, romano e napoletano." In A. Bonadeo, A. Canobbio, and F. Gasti, eds. *Filellenismo e identità romana in età flavia: Atti della VIII Giornata ghisleriana di Filologia classica* (*Pavia, 10–11 novembre 2009*), 15–34. Pavia.

———. (2013). "Un aedo in posa: Stazio e la coscienza di un poeta professionista." In A. Billault and H. Casanova-Robin, eds. *Le poète au miroir de ses vers: Études sur la représentation du poète dans ses oeuvres*, 81–100. Grenoble.

———. (2014). "The *Siluae*: Poetics of Impromptu and Cultural Consumption." In W.J. Dominik and C. Newlands, eds. *Brill Companion to Statius*. Leiden.

Rose, A.R. (1984). "Three Narrative Themes in Apollonius' Bebrykian Episode (*Argonautika* 2.1–163)." *WS* 18: 115–135.

———. (1985). "Clothing imagery in Apollonius's *Argonautika*." *QUCC* 50: 29–44.

Rosen, R.M. (1990). "Poetry and Sailing in Hesiod's *Works and Days*." *ClAnt* 9: 99–113.

Ross, D.O. (2008). "The Sixth Eclogue: Virgil's Poetic Genealogy." In K. Volk, ed. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Vergil's Eclogues*, 189–215. Oxford.
Rossi, L. (2001). *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: A Method of Approach*. Leuven.
Rouse, W.H.D. and Smith, M.F. trans. (1992). *Lucretius, De rerum natura*. Cambridge, Mass.
Rozema, B.J. (1971). *Lucillius the Epigrammatist: Text and Commentary*. Diss. University of Wisconsin at Madison.
Rudd, N. trans. (2004). *Horace, Odes and Epodes*. Cambridge Mass.
Rühl, M. (2006). *Literatur gewordener Augenblick: Die Silven des Statius im Kontext literarische und sozialer Bedingungen von Dichtung*. Berlin.
Ruperti, G.A. ed. (1795–1798). *Caii Silii Italici Punicorum libri septemdecim*, 2 vols. Göttingen.
Rusten, J.S. (1982). *Dionysius Scytobrachion*. Opladen.
Rutherford, R.B. ed. (1992). *Homer: Odyssey Books XIX and XX*. Cambridge.
Sabot, A.F. (1976). *Ovide, poète de l'amour dans ses oeuvres de jeunesse*. Paris.
Sacerdoti, A. (2011). "La festa straordinaria: Saturnali romani e identità europea. Indagini su Stat. *Silv*. 1, 6." In C. De Luzenberger and M.L. Pelosi, eds. *L'idea di Europa*, 153–172. Naples.
———. (2012). *Nouus unde furor: Una lettura del dodicesimo libro della Tebaide di Stazio*. Pisa.
Sansone, D. (1980–1981). "*Totus Livius*: Martial XIV 190." *CB* 57: 86–87.
Santirocco, M.S. (1986). *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*. Chapel Hill, NC.
Sauer, C. (2011). *Valerius Flaccus' dramatische Erzähltechnik*. Göttingen.
Schäfer, C. (1996). *Xenophanes von Kolophon: Ein Vorsokratiker zwischen Mythos und Philosophie*. Stuttgart.
Schenk, P. (1999a) *Studien zur poetischen Kunst des Valerius Flaccus: Beobachtungen zur Ausgestaltung des Kriegsthemas in den Argonautika*. Munich.
———. (1999b). "Die Gesänge des Teuthras: Silius Italicus *Punica* 11.288–302 and 432–482." *RhM* 132: 350–368.
Schetter, W. (1959). "Die Buchzahl der *Argonautica* des Valerius Flaccus." *Philologus* 103: 297–308.
Schiesaro, A. (2003). *The Passions in Play: Thyestes and the Dynamics of Senecan Drama*. Cambridge.
Schimann, F. (1998). "Valerius Flaccus und Vergil: *Interpretatio Virgiliana*." In U. Eigler, E. Lefèvre, and G. Manuwald, eds. *Ratis omnia uincet: Neue Untersuchungen zu den Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus*, 123–139. Munich.
Schmidt, E.A. ed. (2001). *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine*. Geneva.
Schmitt-Pantel, P. (1990). "Sacrificial Meal and Symposion: Two Models of Civic Institutions in the Archaic City?" In O. Murray, ed. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposium*, 14–33. Oxford.
Schneider, W.J. (2000). "Ein Sprachspiel Martials." *Philologus* 144: 339–353.
———. (2001). "*Phidiae putaui*: Martial und der Hercules Epitrapezios des Novius Vindex." *Mnemosyne* 54: 697–720.
Schöffel, C. (2002). *Martial, Buch 8*. Stuttgart.
Schrijvers, P.H. (2006). "Silius Italicus and the Roman Sublime." In R.R. Nauta, H.-J. van Dam, and J.J.L. Smolenaars, eds. *Flavian Poetry*, 97–111. Leiden.

Schubert, W. (1998). "Orpheus in den *Argonautica* des Valerius Flaccus." In U. Eigler, E. Lefèvre, and G. Manuwald, eds. *Ratis omnia uincet: Neue Untersuchungen zu den Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus*, 269–284. Munich.

Schultheiss, J. (2012). "Philosophie des Willens und Erzählstruktur: Die Scheidewegszene in den *Punica* des Silius Italicus." In T. Baier, ed. *Götter und menschliche Willensfreiheit von Lucan bis Silius ltalicus*, 255–274. Munich.

Schwartz, E. (1880). *De Dionysio Scytobrachione*. Diss. University of Bonn.

Scioli, E.J. (2005). *The Poetics of Sleep: Representing Dreams and Sleep in Latin Literature and Roman Art*. Diss. University of California at Los Angeles.

Scott, K. (1975). *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians*. New York.

Segal, C.P. (1965). "*Aeternum per saecula nomen*: The Golden Bough and the Tragedy of History." *Arion* 4: 617–657.

———. (1990). "Dreams and Poets in Lucretius." *ICS* 15: 251–262.

Sens, A. (1994). "Hellenistic Reference in the Proem of Theocritus, *Idyll* 22." *CQ* 44: 66–74.

———. (2007). "One Thing Leads (Back) to Another: Allusion and the Invention of Tradition in Hellenistic Epigrams." In P. Bing and J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, 373–390. Leiden.

———. ed. (2011). *Asclepiades of Samos: Epigrams and Fragments*. Oxford.

Setaioli, A. (1997). "Palinuro: genesi di un personaggio poetico." *BStudLat* 27: 56–81.

Sevieri, R. (2000). "Cantare la città: Tempo mitico e spazio urbano nell'*Istmica* 7 di Pindaro per Strepsiade di Tebe." In P. Angeli Bernardini, ed. *Presenza e funzione della città di Tebe nella cultura greca: Atti del convegno internazionale, Urbino (7–9 luglio 1997)*, 179–192. Pisa.

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. ed. (1990). *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammata*. Stuttgart.

———. trans. (1993). *Martial: Epigrams*, 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.

———. ed. (1997^2). *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili*. Stuttgart.

———. trans. (2003). *Statius*, 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.

Shelton, J.E. (1974). "The Storm Scene in Valerius Flaccus." *CJ* 70: 14–22.

———. (1984). "The Argonauts at Bebrycia: Preservation of Identity in the Latin *Argonautica*." *CJ* 80: 18–23.

Shey, H.J. (1968). *A Critical Study of the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus*. Diss. University of Iowa.

Showerman, G. and Goold, G.P. trans. (1977). *Ovid: Heroides and Amores*. Cambridge, Mass.

Sider, D. (2007). "*Sylloge Simonidea*." In P. Bing and J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, 113–130. Leiden.

Siedschlag, E. (1977). *Zur Form von Martials Epigrammen*. Berlin.

Simon, E. (1979). "Archemoros." *AA* 31–45.

Skiadas, A. (1965). *Homer im griechischen Epigramm*. Athens.

Skutsch, O. ed. (1985). *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford.

Slater, W.J. (1990). "Sympotic Ethics in the Odyssey." In O. Murray, ed. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposium*, 213–220. Oxford.

Smith, A.H. (1987). *A Commentary on Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica II*. Diss. Oxford University.

Smith, K.F. ed. (1913). *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus*. New York.

Smith, R.A. (2005). *The Primacy of Vision in Virgil's Aeneid*. Austin.

Smolenaars, J.J.L. (1991). "Quellen und Rezeption: Die Verarbeitung homerischer motive bei Valerius Flaccus und Statius." In M. Korn and H.J. Tschiedel, eds. *Ratis omnia uincet: Untersuchungen zu den Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus*, 57–71. Hildesheim.

———. (1994). *Statius, Thebaid VII: A Commentary*. Leiden.

———. (2008). "Statius *Thebaid* 1.72: Is Jocasta Dead or Alive? The Tradition of Jocasta's Suicide in Greek and Roman Drama and in Statius' *Thebaid*." In J.J.L. Smolenaars, H.-J. van Dam, and R.R., eds. *The Poetry of Statius*, 215–238. Leiden.

Soerink, J. (2013). "Statius, Silius Italicus and the Snake Pit of Intertextuality." In G. Manuwald and A. Voigt, eds. *Flavian Epic Interactions*, 361–377. Berlin.

Somerville, T. (2010). "Note on a Reversed Acrostic in Vergil *Georgics* 1.429–433." *CPh* 105: 202–209.

Spaltenstein, F. (1986). *Commentaire des Punica de Silius Italicus* (*livres 1 à 8*). Geneva.

———. (1990). *Commentaire des Punica de Silius Italicus* (*livres 9 à 17*). Geneva.

———. (2002). *Commentaire des Argonautica de Valerius Flaccus* (*livres 1 et 2*). Brussels.

———. (2004). *Commentaire des Argonautica de Valérius Flaccus* (*livres 3, 4 et 5*). Brussels.

———. (2005). *Commentaire des Argonautica de Valérius Flaccus* (*livres 6, 7 et 8*). Brussels.

Spanoudakis, K. (2001). "Poets and Telchines in Callimachus' *Aetia*-prologue." *Mnemosyne* 54: 425–441.

———. ed. (2002). *Philitas of Cos*. Leiden.

Spencer, D. (2002). *The Roman Alexander: Reading a Cultural Myth*. Exeter.

Spisak, A.L. (1994). "Martial 6.61: Callimachean Poetics Revalued." *TAPhA* 124: 291–308.

Stanley, K. (1965). "Irony and Foreshadowing in *Aeneid* I, 462." *AJPh* 86: 267–277.

Steiner, R. (1952). *Der Traum in der Aeneis*. Bern.

Stender, J. (1874). *De Argonautarum ad Colchos usque expeditione fabulae historia critica*. Kilia.

Stephens, S. (2003). *Seing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Berkeley.

Stewart, S. (2010). "'Apollo of the shore': Apollonius of Rhodes and the Acrostic Phenomenon." *CQ* 60: 401–405.

Stover, T. (2010). "Rebuilding Argo: Valerius Flaccus' Poetic Creed." *Mnemosyne* 63: 640–650.

———. (2012). *Epic and Empire in Vespasianic Rome: A New Reading of Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica*. Oxford.

Strand, J. (1972). *Notes on Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica*. Gothenburg.

Sturt, N.J.H. (1982). "Four Sexual Similes in Statius." *Latomus* 41: 833–840.

Suerbaum, W. (1968). *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellungen älterer römischer Dichter, Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius*. Hildesheim.

Suleiman, S. (1983). *Authoritarian Fictions*. New York.

Sullivan, J.P. (1987). "Martial." *Ramus* 16: 177–191.

———. (1991). *Martial: The Unexpected Classic*. Cambridge.

Summers, K. (2001). "Catullus' Program in the Imagination of Later Epigrammatists." *CB* 77: 147–160.

Swann, B.W. (1994). *Martial's Catullus: The Reception of an Epigrammatic Rival.* Hildesheim.
———. (1998). "*Sic scribit Catullus*: The Importance of Catullus for Martial's Epigrams." In F. Grewing, ed. *Toto notus in orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation*, 48–58. Stuttgart.
Syme, R. (1958). *Tacitus*, 2 vols. Oxford.
———. (1988). *Roman Papers Vol. IV* (ed. A.R. Birley). Oxford.
Taccone, A. (1909). "Contributi alla ricostruzione dell' *Ipsipile* euripidea." In *MAT* 60: 1–32.
Taisne, A.-M. (2008). "Présence d'Homère dans l'*Achilléide* de Stace." *VL* 178: 94–103.
Taylor, P.R. (1994). "Valerius' Flavian *Argonautica*." *CQ* 44: 212–235.
Tennant, P.M.W. (2000). "Poets and Poverty: The Case of Martial." *AClass* 43: 139–156.
Thalmann, W.G. (2011). *Apollonius Rhodius and the Spaces of Hellenism.* New York.
Thilo, G. (1863). *C. Valeri Flacci Setini Balbi Argonauticon libri VIII.* Halle.
Thomas, R.F. (1982). "Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (Poem 64.1–18)." *AJPh* 103: 144–164.
———. (1983). "Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman Poetry." *CQ* 33: 92–113.
———. (1986). "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference." *HSPh* 90: 171–198.
———. (1988). *Virgil: Georgics*, 2 vols. Cambridge.
Tipping, B. (2007). "*Haec tum Roma fuit*: Past, Present, and Closure in Silius Italicus' *Punica*." In S.J. Heyworth, P.G. Fowler, and S.J. Harrison, eds. *Classical Constructions: Papers in Memory of Don Fowler, Classicist and Epicurean*, 221–241. Oxford.
———. (2010a). *Exemplary Epic: Silius Italicus' Punica*, Oxford.
———. (2010b). "Virtue and Narrative in Silius Italicus' *Punica*." In A. Augoustakis, ed. *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, 193–218. Leiden.
Traglia, A. (1983). "Valerio Flacco, Apollonio Rodio e Virgilio: Gli episodi di Hylas e di Giasone e Medea." *Vichiana* 12: 304–325.
Tromaras, L. (1987). "Die Aurelius- und Furius-Gedichte Catulls als Zyklen, cc. 11, 15, 16, 21, 23, 24, 26." *Eranos* 85: 41–47.
Tueller, M.A. (2008). *Look Who's Talking: Innovations in Voice and Identity in Hellenistic Epigram.* Leuven.
Uccellini, R. (2012). *L'arrivo di Achille a Sciro: Saggio di commento a Stazio Achilleide 1, 1–396.* Pisa.
Urso, A.M. (1992). "'La parola riscritta': Esempi di arte allusiva e meccanismi di riuso negli epigrammi di Marziale di intonazione catulliana (Analisi di Mart. V 62; I 7; IV 30; III 12; VII 14)." *AAPel* 68: 447–472.
Vahlen, I. ed. (1854). *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*. Leipsig.
Van Sickle, J. (1975). "Epic and Bucolic." *QUCC* 19: 45–72.
Venini, P. (1971). "Valerio Flaco e l'erudizione apolloniana: Note stilistiche." *RIL* 105: 582–596.
Vessey, D.W.T.C. (1970). "Notes on the Hypsipyle Episode in Statius: *Thebaid* 4–6." *BICS* 17: 44–55.
———. (1973). *Statius and the Thebaid.* Cambridge.
———. (1974). "Pliny, Martial and Silius Italicus." *Hermes* 102: 109–116.
———. (1975). "Silius Italicus: The Shield of Hannibal." *AJPh* 96: 391–405.
———. (1982). "The Dupe of Destiny: Hannibal in Silius, *Punica* III." *CJ* 77: 320–335.

———. (1985). "Lemnos Revisited: Some Aspects of Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* 2.77–305." *CJ* 80: 326–339.
Veyne, P. (2007). *L'impero greco-romano* (trans. S. Bellingeri). Milan.
Vian, F. (1973). "Notes critiques au chant II des *Argonautiques* d'Apollonios de Rhodes." *REA* 75: 82–102.
———. (1974). *Argonautiques, I: Chants I–II*. Paris.
Vogt, E. (1967). "Das Akrostichon in der griechischen Literatur." *A&A* 13: 80–95.
Volk, K. (2008). *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Vergil's Georgics*. Oxford.
———. (2010). "Aratus." In J. Clauss and M. Cuypers, eds. *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, 197–210. Malden, Mass.
———. (2012). "Letters in the Sky: Reading the Signs in Aratus' *Phaenomena*," *AJPh* 133: 209–240.
Vollmer, F. (1898). *Papinii Statii Siluarum libri*. Leipsig.
Wacht, M. (1991). *Juppiters Weltenplan im Epos des Valerius Flaccus*. Stuttgart.
Wagner, P. (1805). *Commentarius perpetuus in V. Fl. Setini Balbi Argonauticon libros VIII*. Göttingen.
Wathelet, P. (1992). "Argos et l'Argolide dans l'épopée." In M. Piérart, ed. *Polydipsion Argos: Argos de la fin des palais mycéniens à la constitution de l'état classique*, 99–116. Athens.
Watson, L.C. (2003). "Bassa's Borborysms: On Martial and Catullus." *Antichthon* 37: 1–12.
———. (2005). "Catullan Recycling? *Cacata carta*." *Mnemosyne* 58: 270–277.
Watson, P.A. (1982). "Martial's Fascination with *Lusci*." *G&R* 29: 71–76.
Watson, L.C. and Watson, P.A. (2003). *Martial: Select Epigrams*. Cambridge.
Watts, N.H. transl. (1923). *Cicero, The Speeches: Pro Archia poeta, Post reditum in senatu, Post reditum ad Quirites, De domo sua, De haruspicum responsis, Pro Plancio*. Cambridge, Mass.
Weinreich, O. (1928). *Studien zu Martial: Literarhistorische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Stuttgart.
Welch, K.E. (1995). "The Office of Praefectus Fabrum in the Late Republic." *Chiron* 25: 131–145.
West, M.L. (1969). "Near Eastern Material in Hellenistic and Roman Literature." *HSPh* 73: 113–134.
———. trans. (2003). *Greek Epic Fragments*. Cambridge, Mass.
West, S. (2000). "Lycophron's *Alexandra*: Hindsight as Foresight Makes No Sense?" In M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds. *Matrices of Genre. Authors, Canons, and Society*, 153–166. Cambridge, Mass.
Wheeler, A.L. and Goold, G.P. trans. (1988). *Ovid: Tristia and Ex Ponto*. Cambridge, Mass.
Wheeler, S.M. (2002). "Ovid's Metamorphoses and Universal History." In D.S. Levene and D.P. Nelis, eds. *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, 163–189. Leiden.
Whitmarsh, T. (2001). *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford.
Wick, C. (2003). *M. Annaeus Lucanus, Bellum ciuile: Liber IX*, 2 vols. Munich.
Wijsman, H.J.W. (1996). *Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica Book V: A Commentary*. Leiden.

———. (2000). *Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica Book VI: A Commentary*. Leiden.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1924). *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, 2 vols. Berlin.
Williams, C.A. (2002). "*Sit nequior omnibus libellis*: Text, Poet, and Reader in the Epigrams of Martial." *Philologus* 146: 150–171.
———. (2004). *Martial, Epigrams Book Two*. Oxford.
———. (2008). "Epigrammata longa e strategie metapoetiche in Marziale." In A.M. Morelli, ed. *Epigramma longum: Da Marziale alla tarda antichità. Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 29–31 maggio 2006*, 217–233. Cassino.
Williams, Mark F. (1987–1988). "Amor's Head-Cold (*Frigus* in Catullus 45)." *CJ* 83: 128–132.
Williams, Mary F. (1991). *Landscape in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Diss. University of Texas at Austin.
Williams, R.D. (1960). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quintus*. Oxford.
Wills, J. (1996). *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*. Oxford.
Wilson, M. (2004). "Ovidian Silius." *Arethusa* 37: 225–249.
———. (2013). "The Flavian *Punica*?" In G. Manuwald and A. Voigt, eds. *Flavian Epic Interactions*, 13–27. Berlin.
Wimmel, W. (1960). *Kallimachos in Rom: Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*. Wiesbaden.
Winterbottom, M. trans. (1974). *The Elder Seneca: Declamations*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.
Wiseman, T.P. (1985). *Catullus and His World: A Reappraisal*. Cambridge.
Wölke, H. (1978). *Untersuchungen zur Batrachomyomachie*. Meisenheim am Glan.
Wray, D. (2001). *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood*. Cambridge.
Zecchini, G. (2011). "Silio Italico e Domiziano." In L. Castagna, G. Galimberti Biffino, and C. Riboldi, eds. *Studi su Silio Italico*, 29–39. Milan.
Zeiner, N.K. (2005). *Nothing Ordinary Here: Statius as Creator of Distinction in the Siluae*. New York.
Zeitlin, F.I. (2001). "Visions and Revisions of Homer." In S. Goldhill, ed. *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, 195–266. Cambridge.
Zetzel J.E.G. (1983). "Catullus, Ennius, and the Poetics of Allusion." *ICS* 8: 251–266.
Zissos, A. (1999). "Allusion and Narrative Possibility in the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus." *CPh* 94: 289–301.
———. (2002). "Reading Models and the Homeric Program in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*." *Helios* 29: 69–95.
———. (2004a). "Navigating Genres: Martial 7.19 and the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus." *CJ* 99: 405–422.
———. (2004b). "Terminal Middle: The *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus." In S. Kyriakidis and F. De Martino, eds. *Middles in Latin Poetry*, 311–344. Bari.
———. (2005). "Valerius Flaccus." In J.M. Foley, ed. *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, 503–513. Malden, Mass.
———. (2006a). "Sailing and Sea-storm in Valerius Flaccus (*Argonautica* 1.574–642): The Rhetoric of Inundation." In In R.R. Nauta, H.-J. van Dam, and J.J.L. Smolenaars, eds. *Flavian Poetry*, 79–95. Leiden.
———. (2006b). "Reception of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*." *IJCT* 13: 165–185.

———. (2008). *Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica Book 1*. Oxford.

———. (2009). "Navigating Power: Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*." In W.J. Dominik, J. Garthwaite, and P.A. Roche, eds. *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*, 351–366. Leiden.

———. (2012). "The King's Daughter: Medea in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*." *Ramus* 41: 94–118.

Zumbo, A. (1975–1976). "Contributi papiracei al testo di Apollonio Rodio, II." *Helikon* 15–16: 472–480.

GENERAL INDEX

This Index must be used in combination with the *Index Locorum*, as overlap is avoided where possible.

Abas, 102
Absyrtus, 90n102, 119n23
Acamas, 226
Acastus, 128–130, 144
Aceratus, 378n25
Acheron, River, 107–108, 289
Achilles, 95n1, 194n5, 196, 217–219, 235–248, 252–255, 264–266, 283–284
  transvestism of, 2, 217–218
  see also Scipio Africanus
Acme, 359
Acoreus, 269
Acrisius, 64
acrostics, 49–72
  acronym, 52–53
  boustrophedon, 64–65, 68–69
  funerary, 57–58
  gamma, 50–52
  linear, 52
  reversed, 60
  syllabic, 50–52, 54–55
Adrastus, 19–20, 180, 187, 191
Aeetes, 44–45, 69–70, 74, 78n32, 81, 89–92, 113–135, 143, 157–161, 163, 167
Aegaeon, 118
Aegisthus, 262
Aegle, 87
Aeneas, 63, 104–112, 128, 167, 198, 251–266, 269–270, 273, 276, 279–280, 282, 287, 292, 294–298, 301, 315
  see also Augustus, Domitian, Hannibal
Aeson, 74–76, 120n30, 125–130, 139–145
Agamemnon, 15, 256, 262–265, 298n40, 301–302
agones
  literary, 215
Ajax, 295, 302
Alba Longa, 270
Alcaeus, 350
Alcaeus of Messene, 375
alcaic stanza, 195
Alcibiades, 366
Alcimede, 74–76, 125–130
Alcman, 375
Alcmene, 299n45
Alexander the Great, 328
  see also Scipio Africanus
Allecto, 64–66
Alpheus, River, 333
Alps, 251
Amata, 64, 131n54, 237
Amazons, 210–211
Amphiaraus, 171–191
Amphinome, 145
Amphion, 215–233, 283
  see also Statius
Amycus, 56–58, 84–87, 91, 161–164, 166–167, 348
Anacreon, 329
Anausis, 163
Ancaeus, 82
Anchises, 280n48, 312, 314–315, 342
Andromache, 339
Andromeda, 164, 273n22
Anio, 28
Antikleia, 301n55
Antigone, 26, 202–203
Antimachus, 176n27, 187, 374, 384, 389n52
Antioch, 224
Antiochus, 236n3
Antiope, 356
Antipater (of Sidon), 224
  see also Martial
Antiphanes, 350
Antiphilus of Byzantium, 384n40
Antony (Mark), 261, 265, 310
aoidos, *see uates*
Aphrodisias, 225
Aphrodite, *see* Venus
Apollo, 1–2, 71n63, 108, 134n62, 158, 196, 217–218, 230–232, 240, 267, 282, 288, 297, 312, 343–344, 388
  see also Delphi

Apollonius Rhodius, 306
collective speech in, 73–93
male and female, 74–76
lament in, 82
silence in, 73–93
storm in, 82–84
see also Valerius Flaccus
Appius (Claudius Pulcher), 301n55
Apulia, 63–67, 220
Aratus, 196–197
see also Valerius Flaccus
Arcesilaus, 321n43
Archias, 224–225
Archilochus, 329, 370–371
Arestor, 145
Argia, 26
Argo, 175, 185
abandonment of, 91
as first ship, 113–135, 154
catasterism of, 33–48
civilizing voyage of, 164–165
construction of, 33–48, 142–143, 145–148
destruction of, 33–48
stern of, 33–48
stranded, 82
Argos, 186–187, 206, 226
Argus, dog, 19, 59–67
Argus, builder of the Argo, 33–35, 90n105, 114n1, 127n45, 142–143, 145–148
Ariminum, 261
Arion, 283
Aristotle
on the king-"philosopher", 310, 320
Arsinoe the Second, 138n8
Artemis, 332–333
Ascanius, 128, 198
Asclepiades, 374
Assyria, 237–238, 354
Astraea, 51, 274
Atalanta, 146, 239n6
Athamas, 226
Athens, 193–213, 223, 228
Atlas, 280
Atreus, 278
Attis, 335–336, 351
Augeas, 91n109
Augustus, 258n28, 310, 314n23, 333
and Aeneas, 261–263
catasterism of, 54
deification of, 156, 160
see also Domitian, Vespasian
Aurelius, 349–371
Automedon, 226
Avernus, Lake, 106, 108, 211
Avitus, 373

Babylon, 332–333
Bacchus, 23–25, 130n53, 171–191, 244, 261, 263–264, 279, 299, 301, 309, 319, 348
Bacchylides, 329
Barthes, Roland, 156
Bassa, 354
Bassus, 338
Baucis, 348
Bebrycia, 84–87
Bilbilis, 224
Bistones, 24
Boeotia, 199
Boreas, 83, 161n37
sons of, 162, 165–166
Bosporus, 44, 59, 116n13
Briseis, 247
Bruttianus, 330–331, 350, 376
Buthrotum, 296

Cacus, 57, 161, 164, 260–261, 263, 265
Cadmus, 200, 209, 230
Caesar (Julius), 201n13, 255, 263–266, 269, 292–293, 307, 310–311
Caieta, 105–106
Calavius, 279
Calchas, 244
Caligula, 310
Callicula, Mount, 257
Callimachus, 222, 231, 246
Flavian reception of, 345–371
λεπτότης in, 28n59, 54, 345–371
Roman, 220
Telchines in, 357–369
see also Martial
Calliope, 343–344
Camillus, 299n45
Campania, 278n40
Cannae
battle of, 270–271, 273–274, 276–277, 281, 284–285, 302
Canthus, 70, 87, 134n65
Capaneus, 187, 189, 190n80, 206–208
Capua
decadence in, 269–285
request for consulship rights by, 276
see also luxuria, Hannibal

Capys, 272–273, 278n40, 279–280, 285
Caria, 235–236, 332
Carneades, 321n43
Carthage, 143, 177–178, 267–285, 294, 305, 317, 323
Casilinum, 274n24
Cassandra, 388
Castalia, 272
Castor, 27, 89–91, 146, 241, 290, 299, 303
Cato (the Elder), 261, 265
  and the *Lex Oppia*, 236n3
Catullus, *see* Martial
Caudine Forks, 273n21, 279n40
Cecrops, 226
Centaurs, 268, 335, 351
Cerberus, 23n38
Cestos, 356–371
Chalciope, 145
Chimaera, 63–66
Chione, 356
Chiron, 241n11, 245, 283–284
Cicero, *see* Silius Italicus
Ciconian matrons, 283–284
  see also Orpheus
Circe, 114n1, 117n16
Cithaeron, 23
citizenship
  honorary, 219–221
civil war, *see* Valerius Flaccus
ciuilitas, 269
Clashing Rocks, 33–48, 82–83, 95, 160, 162–163, 167
Classicus, 336
Claudia, wife of Statius, 26–27
Claudia Philomathia, 226
Claudius, 160
Claudius Quadrigarius, 323n50
Clementia
  altar (*ara*) of, 211–212, 228
Cleopatra, 261, 265, 269
Clio, 232
Codrus, 226
Colchis, 39, 47, 53, 69–70, 76, 78–79, 81, 89, 100, 113–135, 139–151, 160–164, 172, 339, 351
Colonus, 203
Colosseum, *see* Flavian Amphitheater
comitas, 269
commensality, *see* conviviality
conviviality
  abuses of, 268–271
  carmina conuiuialia, 267
  Greco-Roman ethos of, 267–285
Corfinium, 261n55
Corinna, 197
Cornelia, wife of Pompey, 261n53
Cosconius, 386
Cronus, *see* Saturn
Creon, 202–205, 209n23
Creophylus, 384
Crete, 16, 24–25, 128
Cretheus, 125–130
Crinagoras, 384n40
Croesus, 290
Cumae, 268n6, 280, 287
Cupids, sons of Venus, 271–285
Cybele, 79–80, 132–134
Cyclades, 118
Cyclopes, 367
Cynthia, 229
Cyrene, 223
Cyzicus, 108, 161, 166
  nyctomachia in, 58–59, 78–81, 132–134

Dactyls, 368
Daedalus, 128
Danaus, 115, 117n14
Dares, 348
Daunian, 63–67
decemuiri, 289
Decius Magius, 271n19, 272, 276–277, 279n44, 281, 285
Deidamia, 235–248
Deinomenids, 268n6
Delos, 332, 351
Delphi, 1–2
Demeter, 366
Demodocus, 267n2, 282
Deucalion, 339
deuotio, 205–208
Dicaearchus, 321
Dido, 128, 177, 189, 238n5, 242, 267–285, 348
Diomedes, 253, 256
Dionysius of Miletus, 114n1
Dionysius Scytobrachion, *see* Valerius Flaccus
Dionysus, *see* Bacchus
Dioscuri, 143–144, 299
  see also Castor, Pollux
Dirce, 217–218
Doliones, 21, 58–59, 120n30, 122, 132–134, 166
Dolon, 256

Domitian, 155, 190n80, 213, 220, 231–233, 248, 264, 277n35, 278–279, 308, 342–343, 377
  and Aeneas, 261
  and restoration of Apollo's temple, 1
  and the Saturnalia, 24–25
  as "New Augustus", 263–266
  patronage of Pythian games, 1
  see also Silius Italicus
Domitius Ahenobarbus, 261n55
Domitius Marsus, 330, 350, 369, 386
Dorylaeon, 226
Dymas, 258–260, 264

Egypt, 115, 117n14
ekphrasis, 159, 184n62
Electra, daughter of Atlas, 280
Eleusis, 206
  mysteries at, 228
Elpenor, 95–112, 301n55
Elysium, 246, 290, 300
Endymion, 335, 351
Ennius, 220, 252
  see also Silius Italicus
Entellus, 348
Envy, 365–366
Ephesus, 323, 332
Epicurus, 288
Erato, 194–195
Eratosthenes, 115
Erginus, 38
Erigone, 348
Erinna, 364
Erinys, 200
Eros, 119n23
Erythraea, 226
Eteocles, 24, 183, 200–213
Etruscans, 268
Euboea, 223, 280, 368
Eudemus, 366n78
euergetai
  of the Hellenistic age, 227
Euneus, *see* Hypsipyle, sons of
Euphrates, River, 365–366
Euripides, *see* Statius
Eurotas, River, 241
Euryalus, 257–260, 264, 293
Eurydice, mother of Opheltes, 171–191
Eurypylus, 245n23
Eurystheus, 158–160
Evadne, 206–208
Evander, 75–76, 260

Fabius Maximus
  cunctatio of, 251, 253, 261, 265
  intertextual characterization of, 251–266
  see also Scipio Africanus
Fabullus, 355
Falernus, 257, 263, 301, 348
Fama, 80, 131n54
Fate, 162–164
Fidentinus, 339–340
Fides / *fides*, 267–285
Flaminius, 268
Flavian Amphitheater, 332–334
Fulvius, 275n33
Furies, 211–212
  see also Erinys, Tisiphone
Furius, 349–371
Furius Bibaculus, 360

Gaetulicus, 330
Galatea, 244n18
Galba, 160
Gallus, 350
Gaurus, 375
Germanicus, 310n9
Gerunium
  battle of, 251, 260n42
Gesander, 120n30, 134
Giants, 128n47, 161, 268
Golden Age, 47, 120–123, 156n14, 160, 165, 260, 314
Golden Bough, 110
Golden Fleece, 67–68, 77, 79, 81, 89–90, 113, 125, 127, 129, 135, 137, 139–145, 154, 157, 160, 163, 167, 185
Gorgons, 335, 351

Halicarnassus, 225
Hamilcar, father of Hannibal, 289–290, 302
Hannibal, 17–18, 95n1, 305–324, 328
  as anti-Aeneas, 254
  in Capua, 267–285
  intertextual characterization of, 251–266
Hanno, 273, 284
Harmonia, 367
Harpies, 162–163, 335, 351
Hasdrubal, 271n18
Hebe, 303
Hebrus, 283
Hecate, 70–71, 114n1
Hector, 256, 294–295
Helicon, 27–28, 77, 220, 289
Helle, 77–78, 124n41

Hellenization
of Roman culture, 221, 225
Hellespont, 78, 116n13
hendecasyllables, 195
Hephaestus, *see* Vulcan
Hera, *see* Juno
Heracles, 41, 83–87, 146, 302–303
see also Hercules
Hercules, 40–41, 53–54, 83–87, 148–151, 158–165, 230, 260–261, 263–264, 309, 316–319, 323, 348
catasterism of, 54
epitrapezios, 327–328, 367
see also Jason
Hermaphroditus, 238–239, 335, 351
Herodotus, 225
Hesiod, 77, 196–197, 298n42, 306, 312n16
Hesione, 148–151, 158–164, 167
Hesperides, 77
Hieron of Syracuse, 268n6
Himera, 268n6
Hippodameia, 268
Hippolyte, 210–211
see also Amazons
Hippolytus, 121–122
Hippomedon, 187, 189
Hirtius, 258n28
Hispania Baetica, 220
Homer, 196–197
Doloneia in, 252, 256–264
similes in, 235–248
see also Martial, Scipio Africanus, Silius Italicus, Statius
Hopleus, 258–260, 264
hospitality
Greco-Roman, 267–285
Hyacinthus, 344n78
Hylas, 78n31, 98, 162, 335, 351
Hypermestra, 226
Hypsipyle, 14, 53, 117–118, 130n53, 171–191
sons of, 171–191

Icarius, 348
Icarus, 128
Idmon, 35, 87–89, 95–112
Inachus, 61–67
insomnia
and festivities, 22–26
and helmsmen, 20–22
and leaders / "masculine", 14–20
and poetics, 13–29
animal, 14
autobiographical, 26–29
divine, 14
human, 14
in Silius Italicus, 13–29
in Statius, 13–29
in Valerius Flaccus, 13–29
"positive", 15
Io, 59–67
Iolcus, 122, 130n52
Iopas, 267n2, 280
Iphis, 70–71
Iron Age, 121–122, 131, 134, 156n14
Ismene, 203
Issa, 340
Iulius Nicanor, 226

Janus, 167
Jason, 21–22, 38, 44–45, 53–54, 67–71, 74–135, 139–151, 153, 157–168, 171–191
and Hercules, 166–167
Juno, 33–36, 44, 61–68, 141–143, 294
Jupiter, 19, 61–67 79n39, 83–87, 122–123, 126, 134n62, 143, 161–165, 187, 272, 274, 279–280, 298–299, 309, 314–315, 343
epulum Iouis, 268
Tarpeian, 268
see also Scipio Africanus, Zeus
Juturna, 53

katabasis, 104–112
see also Scipio Africanus

Laelius, 252
Laevius, 350
Laius, 24, 201
lament, *see* Apollonius Rhodius, Valerius Flaccus
Langia, 352
Laomedon, 148–151, 158–160
Lapiths, 268
Latinus, 131n54
Latium, 196–199
Lavinia, 68
blush of, 235–248
Leda, 299n45
Lemnos, 14, 53–54, 79–81, 117–118, 120n30, 122, 130–132, 148, 171–191
Leonidas (of Tarentum?), 375
Lesbia, 353–355, 358
Libyan goddesses, 77–78, 82, 87
Linus, 2, 343

Liternum, 295n30
Locri, 225
locus horridus, 257
Loyalty / loyalty, *see* Fides / fides
Lucan, *see* Silius Italicus
Lucillius, 338–340, 344, 350
Lucius Julius, 357
Lucius Verus, 226
Lucretius, *see* Silius Italicus
Lucullus, 324n50
Ludi
  Romani, 268
luxuria
  in Capua, 267–285
Lycomedes, 16, 240n8
Lycophron, 197
  see also Martial
Lycoris, 340
Lycurgus, king of Nemea, 171–191
Lycus, 87, 95, 109
Lygdamus, 240
Lysaniës, 337
Lysippus, 327–328

Maecenas, 216, 357
Maenads, 178, 283–284
Maeonia, 196–197, 217–218, 235–248
Mago, 252, 256, 273–274, 281–282
Mamercus, 338
Mamurra, 335, 351
Mamurianus, 356–371
Manlius Vopiscus, 28–29
Mantua, 220, 224n23, 252, 292
Maraxes, 256
Marcellus (M. Claudius), 296–297
Mars, 18–19, 79–81, 130, 134n63, 183n57, 210, 315
Martial
  and Antipater, 332–334, 342–343, 374–375
  and Catullus, 327–371
  and Homer, 373–391
  and Lycophron, 387–390
  and Ovid, 381–383
  and Philitas, 387–390
  and Silius Italicus, 343–344, 373
  and Statius, 327–391
  and the Greek epigrammatic tradition, 327–344, 373–391
  and the poetics of contradiction, 328
  Apophoreta, 373–391
  influence of Callimachus on, 327–391
  talking books in, 373–391
  “window allusions” in, 345–371
Massagetae, 242–243
Mausolus, 333
Medea, 26n52, 38n18, 48n45, 67–71, 90n102, 92, 114, 117n16, 119n23, 130n52, 335, 339, 348, 351
Melpomene, 217
Memnon, 294n24
Memphis, 332
Menander, 226
Menelaus, 235–237, 256
Menestratus, 339
Menoeceus, 190n80, 205–208
Mercury, 14–15, 23n38, 24, 62, 219, 348
Mettus Fufetius, 270
Mezentius, 161
Minerva, 33–34, 44, 79n39, 141–142, 210, 242n13, 330, 376
Minos, 128
Minucius, 251, 261n53
Misenus, 95–112, 196
Mithridates, 324n50
modestia, 267–285
Molorcus, 328, 348
Mopsus, 58, 87, 90n105, 97, 116, 161, 163
Mucia, wife of Pompey, 262
Murrus, 277
Mysia, 90n102

Naevius, 306
Naples
  bilingualism in, 2, 177, 193–213, 215–233
Narcissus, 239n6
Nausicaa, 189
Nemea, 171–191, 263–264
Neoptolemus, 245n22, 253–254, 262, 265, 302
Neptune, 82–87, 105–108, 116, 158
Nero, 160, 263, 310, 333–334
  Domus Aurea of, 334
Nestor, 252–256, 265–266, 295
Nicylla, 340
Nile, River
  source of, 269
Niobe, 339
Nisus, 257–260, 264–265, 293
Noricum, 259, 265
Novius Vindex, 327–328
Numa, 369
Numanus Remulus, 134

Octavian, *see* Augustus
Odysseus, 15–17, 19–20, 251–266, 276, 295, 301–302
see also Ulysses
Oedipus, 200–213, 283, 335, 351
Olympia, 190–191
Olynthus, 211–212
Opheltes, 171–191, 231
Orestes, 177, 211–212
Orpheus, 61, 67, 87, 146, 172, 175, 229, 267n2, 280n47, 283, 312, 319, 343
decapitation of, 283–284
Oscan, 278n40
Otho, 160
Ovid, *see* Martial

Pacuvius (Ninnius Celer), 271n19, 276, 279, 281
Paeligni, 220, 224
Palaemon, 230, 336–337
Palinurus, 20–21, 95–112
Pallas, *see* Minerva
Pallas, son of Evander, 75–76
Pallene, 161
Pan, 79–80
Panaetius, 308, 321
Pandarus, 254, 265
Pandora, 368n85
Pansa, 258n28
Paris
"Judgment of", 283–284, 316–317
Parmenion, 341
Parthenopaeus, 189, 191, 258, 335, 351
Parthenope, 29, 223, 227
see also Naples
Patroclus, 95n1, 245n23
Paulus (L. Aemilius), 274, 302
Pedo, 330, 386
Peleus, 77–78, 90n105, 247n29
Pelias, 74, 124–128, 139–145, 157–160, 162
murder of, 47n42, 130n52
Pelion, Mt., 143
Penates, 78n31
Penelope, 26n52
Penthesilea, 294n24
Pentheus, 177
Peripatetics, 320
Perolla, 276, 279, 281
Persephone, 206
Perses, 69–70, 79, 81, 113–135, 160
Perseus, 141–142, 273n22
Petrarch, 347n10
Peuce, 67
Phaethon, 339
Phasis, 28
Phidias, 327
Philemon, 348
Philetas, 222, 362
Philip of Thessalonica
Garland of, 340–342, 350, 364
Philistius, 226
Philitas, *see* Martial
Phineus, 107, 126, 162, 167
Phoebus, *see* Apollo
Phrixus, 74–75, 78, 113, 124, 145, 157–158
sons of, 90, 91n109, 124–125
Phrygia, 226
Phthonos, *see* Envy
Pietas, 207–208
Pindar, 195–197, 221–223, 232–233, 342
καιρός in, 233
Piraeus, 290
Pirithous, 268
Planktai, *see* Wandering Rocks
Plato
on the "good king", 307
Pleiades, 51
Pollius Felix, 219, 230, 283, 348
Pollux, 56–58, 84–87, 91, 146, 161–164, 166, 299, 303, 348
Polydeuces, *see* Pollux
Polynices, 183, 200–213
Polyphemus, 57, 161, 367
Pompey, 95n1, 201n13, 255, 261–263, 269, 307, 310–311
Pomponia, mother of Scipio Africanus, 297–299, 301n55, 314–315
Posidonius, 308, 321
Priam, 245n22, 253–254, 262, 265
primitivism, 113–135
Proconessus, 21
Prodicus, 316n32
Promachus, 144–145
Prometheus, 35–36, 39–41, 162–165, 167
Proteus, 165
Psamathe, 2
Ptolemy Philadelphos, 138n8
Punic Wars
First, 294n25
Second, 251–324
Pygmalion, 244n18
Pylos, 255
pyramids, 333–334

Pyrrhus of Epirus, 308
Pyrrhus, *see* Neoptolemus
Pythagoras, 320

Quintia, 353, 358
Quintianus, 359
Quirinus, *see* Romulus

Raphael, 316n33
recitationes, 215
recusatio, 336, 351, 357
redundancy, 156–168
 types of, 156–157
Regulus, 294n25
Remus, 41
Rhegium, 225
Rhesus, 256
Rhodope, 28
Rhomos, 280n48
Rhyndacus, 21
Romanization
 of provinces, 225
Rome
 as *caput mundi*, 305
Romulus, 41, 299
Rubicon, River, 261n55
Rutulian, 63–67, 257

Sabines, 309
Saguntum, 251, 270, 276–277
Salii, 86
Salmacis, 238–239
Samnites, 278n40
sapphic stanza, 195
Sappho, 197, 329
Sarpedon, 343n74
Saturn, 122–123
Saturnalia, 334
Sauromatae, 114n1
Scipio Aemilianus, 317
Scipio Africanus, 252–253, 264
 and Achilles, 287–304, 313
 and Fabius, 322
 apotheosis of, 298–300
 as son of Jupiter, 299–302, 314–315
 imitatio of Alexander the Great by, 287–324
 katabasis of, 287–304
 meeting with Homer, 287–304
 meeting with Virtus and Voluptas, 17–18, 269, 272n20, 275, 298–300, 303n63, 305–324
Scipio the Elder, father of Africanus, 271n18, 309, 315–316
Scylla, 335
Scyros, 2, 217–218, 235–248
Seneca, *see* Valerius Flaccus
Septimius, 359
Severus, 343, 386
Sibyl, 287–304
Sibylline books, 71n63
Sigeum, 117n14, 148–151
silence, 73–93
 see also Apollonius Rhodius, Valerius Flaccus
Silenus, 280n47
Silius Italicus
 and Cicero, 290, 306–324
 and Ennius, 287–324
 and Homer, 251–266, 287–324
 and Lucan, 261–266, 292–293
 and Lucretius, 287–324
 and Statius, 255, 258–259, 264–266
 and the tradition on kingship, 305–324
 and Virgil, 253–255, 259–261, 263–266, 287–304
 as pro-Domitianic poet, 251–266
 Nekyia in, 287–324
 Stoicism in, 310, 314, 343
 the power of lyre and music in, 267–285
 “window references” to other poets in, 251–266
 see also insomnia, Martial, Scipio Africanus
Silver Age, 156n14, 165, 280n47
Sirius, 364
Sleep / sleep, 259
 and poetics, 13–29
sleeplessness, *see* insomnia
Smyrne, 224n23
Socrates, 320, 366
Sol, 113–114, 124, 143, 159, 163, 333–334
Somnus / somnus, *see* Sleep / sleep
Sophocles, *see* Statius
Sophonisba, 236n3
Sophron, 197
Sotades, 336
Sparta, 223
speech
 collective, 73–93
  primary, 73
  secondary, 73
 see also Apollonius Rhodius, Valerius Flaccus

sphragis, 56, 58, 228
Statius
  and Homer, 235–248
  and Euripides, 171–191, 205–212
  and Greek culture, 215–233
  and Greek epic cycle, 199–201
  and Greek tragedy, 193–213
  and Roman imperial élite, 215–233
  and Sophocles, 203–205
  as a poet of *tria corda*, 223
  as "new Amphion", 223–232
  epicedion for his father, 196–199, 223, 246–247
  father of, 193–213
  generic experimentalism in the *Siluae*, 215–233
  Greek and Roman elements in the *Siluae*, 194–199
  imperialism in, 208–212
  Romanitas of, 194
  self-representation as transnational *uates* 215–233
  symbol of the lyre in, 215–233
  see also insomnia, Martial, Silius Italicus, Valerius Flaccus
Stesichorus, 197
Stenius, 279
Stoic
  cosmology, 42n34
storm, *see* Apollonius Rhodius, Valerius Flaccus
Stratonicos, 226
Suleiman, Susan, 153–154
Sulla, 328
Sun
  Colossus of, 333–334, 386
  see also Sol
Surrentum, 230
symbolism, 153
Symplegades, *see* Clashing Rocks

Tarentum, 225
Tasso, 347n10
teichoscopy, 114
Teiresias, 301n55
Telamon, 91, 146, 148–151
telestich, 64n44, 69
Teuthras, 267–285
Thalia, 342
Thebes, 177, 200–213, 215–233, 255
Themistocles, 226
Theseus, 203–213, 226
Thespiae, 34, 142, 145–148
Thessaly, 127n45, 129–130, 139–145
Thetis, 26n52, 235–248
Thiodamas, 259, 264
Thoas, father of Hypsipyle, 14, 117–118, 130n53, 171–191
Thoas, son of Hypsipyle, *see* Hypsipyle, sons of
Thrace, 79, 117n16, 172
Thyestes, 201n13, 278, 335, 339, 351
Tiberius, 160
Ticinus, River, 251, 308, 315
Tiphys, 21–22, 35, 51, 83–84, 87–89, 95–112, 147, 154
Tisiphone, 61–67
Titans, 285
Tithonus, 238
Titius, 222
Titus, 155
Trasimene, Lake, 251
Trebia, River, 251, 311
Triballi, 315n30
Triptolemus, 226
Triton, Lake, 87
Troy, 253, 257, 261, 280, 288, 292, 296–297, 315
Turnus, 63–68, 161, 237, 251–266
Tydeus, 183, 189, 190n80, 191, 258
Typhoeus, 48n45, 161
typology, 153

Ulysses, 197, 245, 367
  see also Odysseus
Umbria, 220
Underworld, 62–67, 71, 105–106, 112, 165, 277, 287–324
  see also Scipio Africanus

Valerius Flaccus
  and Apollonius Rhodius, 33–48, 95–112, 113–135
  and Aratean tradition, 33–72
  and Dionysius Scytobrachion, 137–151, 157–158
  and Seneca, 119–122
  and Statius, 118
  and Virgil, 99, 104–112
  as *quindecimuir*, 55n21, 71
  collective speech in, 73–93
  civil war in, 33–48, 113–135, 160–164
  funerals in, 95–112
  ideological epic of, 153–168

lament in, 82–84, 87–89
monsters in, 160–164
silence in, 73–93
storm in, 58, 82–84, 115–116, 162
syncopated narration in, 78
Romanization in, 97–99, 111–112
tyrants in, 157–160
see also insomnia
Varro of Atax, 114n1
uates, *see* Statius
Velox, 340–341
Venus, 18–19, 79–80, 105, 117n16, 130–132, 178, 183n57, 238n5, 271–285, 301, 314n23, 317, 368
see also Cupids
Verona, 224
Vespasian, 47
and Argonauts, 163
and Augustus, 153–168
and Jason, 153
and Julio-Claudians, 154, 160, 263, 309
as *restitutor libertatis*, 167–168
coins with, 167–168
deification of, 154–156
Lex de imperio of, 160
Veturius Mamurius, 368–369
Vibius Maximus, 195, 221
Virgil, *see* Silius Italicus, Statius
Virtus, 207–208
see also Scipio Africanus
Vitellius, 160
Volturnus, 257
Voluptas, *see* Scipio Africanus
Volusius, 358n51
Vulcan, 45–46, 130–132, 260, 367–368

Wandering Rocks, 45–46

Xanthus, River, 296n31
Xenophanes of Colophon, 335–336

Zama, 284
Zeus, 15, 22–23, 41, 83, 123, 126, 200, 268, 333
Ammon, 299
in Nemea, 172
Xenios, 125
see also Jupiter

INDEX LOCORUM

ACCIUS
Clytemnestra 262
Medea 391–394 (Ribbeck) 115

AELIAN
Varia Historia
9.14 362n64

AESCHYLUS
Prometheus Bound
436–471 165n52

ANACREONTEA
16.23 236n4

ANTHOLOGIA LATINA
226–227 (Shackleton Bailey) 338

ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA
6.49 383n37
6.107 383n37
6.113 383n37
6.124–125 383n37
6.127 383n37
6.148 383n37
6.159 383n37
7.1–2 375, 378n25
7.8.7–8 343–344
7.18–19 375
7.138.3 378n25
7.490 374
9.25 375
9.26 341n65
9.58 333, 343
9.63 374, 384
9.191–192 384n40, 387–390
9.239 384n40
9.342 341
9.790 332n27
11.20 370
11.68 340
11.91–94 362n63
11.104 339n57
11.131 339n57
11.214 339
11.319 226
11.321–322 364–367
12.43 337
14.45 389n53
14.60 389n53

ANTHOLOGIA PLANUDEA
305.1–2 342–343

ANTIMACHUS
Lyde
32 (Sens) 384

APOLLODORUS
Library
1.9.1 114n1
1.9.28 114n1
2.1.3 59n31
2.5.1 328n5
2.7.8 146n27
3.64 187

APOLLONIUS RHODIUS
Argonautica
1.1–4 154, 162
1.5–17 139–140
1.5–7 127
1.15–17 157n19
1.18–19 142n17
1.19–20 123n39
1.105–108 102n32
1.105 147n29
1.144–145 102n32
1.234–319 74–75
1.242–246 127n45
1.278–282 76n22, 127n45
1.325 145
1.341–343 84
1.496–511 267n2, 280n47
1.526–527 33n1
1.566–568 144
1.611–614 81
1.614–615 130
1.622 118, 154n8
1.721–724 33n1

Argonautica (*cont.*)
1.793–833 184
1.851 132
1.961–963 132
1.1003–1010 33n1
1.1015–1025 81, 133
1.1315–1320 85n74
2.1–163 161
2.5–168 84–85
2.145–153 74
2.155–163 86n84
2.311–316 126
2.317–340 162
2.448–450 27
2.601–602 39
2.624–626 127n45
2.815–1285 100
2.815–863 88, 95–112
2.851–858 82 b.55
2.864–898 101
2.890 125
2.1140–1151 158
2.1246–1259 165
2.1251–1255 40
3.169–178 90–91
3.182 125
3.194–195 90
3.302–316 90
3.317–367 90n105, 91
3.333–339 157n19
3.333–336 127n45
3.340–344 48
3.351–353 114n1
3.367–575 89–92
3.744–760 26n52
3.1299–1304 45
4.445–449 119n23
4.452–481 119n23
4.854–855 78
4.924–929 45
4.984 77n29
4.1058–1072 26n52
4.1250–1276 82–84
4.1251–1258 74
4.1310–1314 77n29, n. 30
4.1318–1329 74, 77–78, 82, 87
4.1333–1392 77
4.1380–1536 87
4.1458–1460 74

Appendix Vergiliana
Ciris
14 298n42
62 378n25

Appian
Hannibalic War
5.18 315n28

Apuleius
Metamorphoses
9.27.20–21 378n26

Aratus
Phaenomena
1–2 58, 65n45
1 55
6–8 65
24–26 43–44
110–111 120n25
247–249 60n34
342–352 36–37
686 38
778–787 49–50, 62, 65
803–806 60n34
1060–1063 60n34

Aristaenetus
Epistles
1.1 236n4

Aristophanes
Frogs
939–943 362–363
940 335n40

Aristotle
On Kingship
2 320n40

Athenaeus
Deipnosophistae
134D–137C 274n22
552B 362n64

[Bion]
Epithalamium Achillis et Deidameiae
2.17–18 (Gow) 236n4
2.18–19 240n8

CALLIMACHUS
Aetia
fr. 1.1–2 (Harder) 349n18, 357, 364, 388
1.17 366
1.18 385
1.23–24 362, 388
60c 328n5
Epigrams
5 (Pfeiffer) 374
6 377, 384
26 374
27 352, 359, 367n81
28 337, 353
56 374
Fragments
398 (Pfeiffer) 374
465 357, 386n44
Hymns
2.108–112 366n76, 367n81
5.27–28 236n4
Iambs
1.82–83 366n78
2.10 366n78
3 353, 361
fr. 222.1–22 362

CATULLUS
Carmina
1–5 330
1 363, 386n44
4 341n62
10–11 341n62
13.11–14 356
14 341n62
15 355, 359–360, 371
16 360, 371
17 341n62
21 356, 361, 371
22–23 341n62, 370
23–24 356, 361, 371
23.12–14 363
27 371
29 341n62
34 341n62
36–37 341n62
39 341n62
42 341n62
44–45 341n62, 359
48 363
50 341n62
51 195
55 341n62
58.5 189n80
61.185–188 236
63.7–8 239n6
64 98, 347–348
64.1–7 115
64.13–14 165n52
64.47–49 237
64.59 247n29
65.16 330, 331n17
66 331n17
71 358
76 341n62
85 68, 362n65
86 352, 358
95.4–7 366n77
105 368
116 357
116.2 330

CICERO
Arati Phaenomena
126–138 36n15
De Amicitia
18 321n47
De Diuinatione
2.111–112 71n63
De Finibus
2.118 299n44
3.11 321n47
De Legibus
1.24–27 316n32
2.19 299n44
2.39 269n9
De Natura Deorum
2.62 299n44
2.89 115n6
De Officiis
1.118 316–317
2.31–51 318
3.16 321n47
3.25 299n44
3.104 270n17
De Republica
fr. 2 (Powell) 299n43
1.1 316n32
1.4–7 316n32
1.54 317
1.69 317–318
3.1 316n32
3.7 321n47
3.47 318
6.13 318

De Republica (*cont.*)
6.17 299n43
6.29–30 298–299n43, 318
Epistulae ad Atticum
7.11.1 262n57
Lucullus
2.3 324n50
Philippicae
2 269n9
Pro Archia
5 224–225
15–16 321
19 224–225
24 290, 313
Pro Sestio
143 299n44
Tusculanae Disputationes
1.1 321n46
1.27–28 299n44
1.32 299n44

CINNA
fr. 11 (Courtney) 54

CLAUDIANUS
Carmina
20.434–441 57n24
De Raptu Proserpinae
1.272 237n4

CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM LATINARUM
6.28753.10–12 57
14.2224b.7 57

CURTIUS RUFUS
Historiae Alexandri
4.7.8 315n26
8.1.24 315
8.7.5 274n22

CYCLIC *THEBAIS*
fr. 1 (West) 186–187
2 200
3 200–201

[DEMETRIUS]
De Elocutione
190–235 365, 370

DIO CASSIUS
Roman History
42.5.3–5 262
46.39 258n28
fr. 56.43 315n28
67.9 278n38

DIO CHRYSOSTOM
Orations
1 314n24
1.7 316n31
1.70–82 318n37
2 309n7, 319n39
2.6 312n14
2.26 320n41
31.116 225–226

DIODORUS SICULUS
Library
3.52.3 137n4
4.40.1–3 139–142, 157
4.40.5 141–142
4.41 117n16
4.41.1–3 143, 146
4.42 148–151, 158
4.43.1–4 143–144
4.45 114n1
4.48.5 146
4.49.3–7 158
4.50.1–2 144–145

DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS
Antiquitates Romanae
1.73.3 280n48
3.2–30 270n16

DIONYSIUS SCYTOBRACHION
F 14 (Jacoby) 139–148, 151, 157
F 15 149
F 16 149n37

ENNIUS
Annales
3 (Skutsch) 312
12–13 294n25
54–55 298
361 236–237
404–406 293n22
477 350n24
534–535 241n11
Medea exul 347–348
Varia
3 (Vahlen) 295n26
18 301
23–24 299n43

[ERATOSTHENES]
Catasterismoi
1.35 36n15

EURIPIDES
Antiope
227
Hippolytus
1253–1254 389n53
Hypsipyle
fr. 752 (Collard and Cropp) 178
752a 178
752a.10 185
752b.5 185
752d–e 182
752d.10 188n76
752f.9–11 185
752f.19–28 176, 184–185
752g 185
752g.8–14 175
752h 185
754b.2–3 188
757.57–62 190n84
757.106–107 187–188
757.122–128 180
759a 172, 181
765a 183
Iphigenia at Aulis
39 389n53
Medea 347–348
1–13 123
Phoenissae
1090–1199 205–206
Supplices
399–563 209
980–1113 206–208

EUSTRATIUS
Ad Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea
6.7.2 377n24

GERMANICUS
Aratea
21–23 44
344–355 36n15
345 39n23
350–352 37
489 39n23
620 39n23
684 39n23

HARPOCRATION
Μαργίτης 377n24

HESIOD
Works and Days
25–41 121n31
111 123
122–143 123n38
118–237 121n31
289–292 298n42
649–650 121n31

HOMER
Iliad
1.247–248 295n28
2.1–47 15
2.816 295n28
4.141–147 235–236
5.583 236n2
5.787 59
6.506–511 241n11
7.213 295n28
7.475–482 22–24
8.228 59
9.241 39n23
11.57 295n28
11.822–848 245n22
14.214 368
19.217–219 295n28
20.23–29 280n48
22.304–305 82n52
23.83–84 95n1
Odyssey
1.1 295
1.5 232n44
5.269–275 20
5.282–450 82
8.75–82 267n2
8.499–520 267n2
9.76–84 82n53
10.476–481 15n16
11.51–83 301n55
11.90–224 301n55
11.373–381 27
11.387–466 301–302n56
11.473–476 302n57
11.538–564 302n58 andn59
11.601–605 303
11.618–619 302n60
12.15 110
12.31–35 15n16
12.189–190 77n29

Odyssey (*cont.*)
13.73–95 20
13.200–216 82n52
15.390–397 27
19.335–342 16–17
19.508–517 26n52
19.588–604 27
20.1–97 15n16

[Homer]
Margites 377
Oichalias Halosis 377

Horace
Ars Poetica
391–407 227
Carmina
1.1.35–56 228
1.3 120
1.3.38–40 128n47
1.6.2 246n25, 378n25
1.6.10 284n62
1.24.14 282n53
1.36.1 282n53
2.16.38–40 366–367n81
3.3.9–36 299n44
3.3.9–16 263
3.30.1–2 293n22, 334
3.30.6–7 301
3.30.7–9 293
3.30.10–14 220, 290n4
4.2.1–4 221
4.2.25–32 221
4.3.13–16 217, 228
4.8.13–29 298n41
4.8.29–34 299n44
4.9.5 246n25
Epistulae
1.3.9–13 222
1.3.10 218n6
1.19.8 371n94
1.19.23–24 290n4
2.1.5–17 299n44
Sermones
1.2 352
1.4.11 366n77
1.4.22–23 336n44
1.10.50–51 366n77

Hyginus
Astronomica
2.37 36n15
Fabulae
pr. 36 114n1
74 187, 190
89 148n33
273 181n52

Inscriptiones Graecae II^2
3786–3789 226n30

Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae
8905 1

Inscriptions of Aphrodisias
12.27 225n27

Juvenal
Saturae
1.94–95 269n13, 279n42
1.135–141 269n13, 279n42
1.142–143 281n52
4 269n10
5 269n10

Lactantius
In Thebaida
5.714–719 184n58
5.728 184n58

Livius Andronicus
Equus Troianus 262

Livy
Ab Vrbe Condita
1.22–26 270n16
4.37.1 278n40
8.11.16 279n40
9.17–19 310n8
10.8.2 71n63
21.4.6–7 17n23
21.46.7 315n28
22.16–17 257
23.8–9 271n19
23.9.4 274n22
23.18 274n24
26.19.3–9 315n27
26.36.11 219n8
34.4.6 236n3
35.14.5–12 323
39.43.4 274n22

[Longinus]
On the Sublime
3.1 335n40
4 335n40
4.6 389n53

Lucan
De Bello Ciuili
1.8–23 122n35
1.109–111 201n13
1.129–147 255
1.205–212 255, 261n55
1.228 261n55
1.303–305 262
1.324–362 255
1.493–498 261
2.234–235 261n52
2.315 261n52
2.478–525 262
2.511–512 261n55
3.441 48n43
4.7 19n30
5.560–677 82
5.732–733 261n53
8.663–711 261–262
9.336 343n75
9.961–999 292–294
9.980–986 313n21
10.20–52 310n10
10.20 299n47
10.109–333 269

Lucian
Dialogi Mortuorum
25 324

Lucretius
De Rerum Natura
1.25 289
1.117–126 289–291
1.119 294n25
1.124 312
1.927–928 366n77
2.8–9 298n42
4.2–3 366n77
5.19 288
5.22–42 303n63
5.68–69 288

Lycophron
Alexandra
1461–1474 388

Martial
Spectacula
1 332–334
2.1–3 333
3 334
Epigrammata
1 *praef.* 9–13 329–330
1 *praef.* 15–16 334n35
1.1 373
1.1.2 294n25, 337n45
1.7.3–4 329n10
1.32 354
1.52 359
1.61.1 329n10
1.61.11–12 224
1.70.7–8 334n32
1.72 339–340
1.92 337n47, 349n18, 356, 358, 360–362, 365–368, 371
1.107 357–358, 361
1.109.1 329n10, 340–341
1.110 340–342
1.111–117 342
1.113.6 378n27
2.1.6 378n27
2.6.2–4 386
2.6.10 362n65
2.71.3 329n10, 330n13
2.77 330n13, 386
2.86 336–338
2.88 338
3.68 387
4.8.7–12 378n26
4.10.4 378n27
4.14 378
4.14.13–14 329n10
4.23 330–331, 350, 375–376
4.29 330n13
4.49.1–2 375n14
4.64.30 328n5
4.82 381n33, 387
4.87 354, 368n88
4.89.7–9 387
5.5 330n13
5.5.6 329n10
5.10.8 246n25
5.13.3 337n45
5.53 338–339
5.65 261
5.80.3 378n27
6.34.7 329n10

Epigrammata (*cont.*)
6.61 351n25
6.64.6 337n45
6.64.7–8 378n27
6.65.5–6 385–387
7.11.4 378n27
7.14.3 329n10
7.19 48n43
7.21–23 373
7.26.5 378n26
7.29 330n13
7.63 373
7.99.7 329n10, 330n13
8 *praef.* 15–18 334n35
8.3 342
8.3.4 337n45
8.18 331n18
8.26.5–8 263
8.54 368n88
8.55 330n13
8.55[56].21–24 369n92
8.73.8 329n10 andn11
8.73.9–10 224
9 *praef.* 337n45
9 *praef.* 5–9 373, 378n27
9.43 327–328
9.44 327–328
9.50 375
9.86 343
9.97.1–4 337n45
10.1 373, 381–385
10.2 382–383
10.4 330, 334–336, 351–352, 368
10.9.3–4 337n45
10.10.11 384n41
10.18.4 378n27
10.20 330n13, 378
10.59.1–2 385–386
10.64.2 378n26
10.78.16 329n10, 331n20
10.103.3–6 224
10.103.5 329n10
11.2 334n35
11.6.16 329n10, 334n35
11.15 334n35
11.33.3 367n81
11.48 373
11.101.1 362n65
12.23 340n58
12.44.5 329n10
12.59.3 329n10
12.83.4 329n10
12.94.10 375
13.1–3 334n35
13.2.4 378n27
13.71–72 374
14.1–2 334n35, 381n33, 387
14.3 379
14.41 374
14.58 374
14.77 329n10
14.100 329n10
14.152 329n10
14.154 374
14.170–182 379
14.183–196 373, 380
14.183 246n25, 376–391
14.190 380
14.195 329n10

Musaeus
Hero and Leander
58 236n4

Musonius Rufus
Discourses
8.32–40 320n41

Mythographi Vaticani
2.164 181

Naevius
Bellum Punicum 294n25
Equus Troianus 262

Nonnus
Dionysiaca
1.165–218 48n45

Onesicritus
134 F17 (Jacoby) 320

Orphica
Argonautica
122–123 147n29

Ovid
Amores
praef. 382–383
1.3.25 294
1.6.44 19n30
1.15.1 367n81
1.15.7–13 294n25

1.15.25–26 293n16
1.15.41–42 301n53
2.4.19 331n17
2.5.33–42 238
2.5.38 240n10
2.5.39 244n20
2.11.1–6 115
3.1 342
3.3.5–6 236n4
3.9.25 246n25
3.9.62 329n11
3.15.7–8 220
Ars Amatoria
1.137–138 360n56
2.4 378n25
2.740 294n25
3.339–340 229n36
Epistulae ex Ponto
3.1.55–58 218n8
3.1.140 70n56
3.3.31 246n25, 378n25
4.12.27 246n25
Fasti
3.260–392 369n91
Heroides
4.131–133 123
6.97 44n37
11.17–18 219n8
12.16–17 115
15.28 294n25
Metamorphoses
1.89–150 121
1.113–114 123
1.128–150 274n23
3.423 236n4, 239n6
4.329–333 238–239
4.332 236n2
4.670–734 164
5.40 273–274n22
6.721 115
7.365 367n81
8.549–559 366n77
10.214–216 344n78
10.282–286 244n18
10.369 19n30
10.591–596 239n6
11.56–60 283n60
11.474–572 82
15.147–152 298n42
15.870 54
15.871–872 293n22
15.875–876 301n53
15.876–879 293n16
Remedia Amoris
373 246n25, 378n25
753 284n62
Tristia
2.361–374 247–248
2.427–430 329n11
4.10.22 246n25
4.10.51–54 229n36
4.10.59–60 294n25
5.1.17–20 229n36

PAPYRI
P. Hibeh. 2.186 138
P. Mich. Inv. 1316 149
P. Oxy. VI 852 172
P. Oxy. 2079 357, 362

PAUSANIAS
Description of Greece
3.18.12 191
9.32.4 147n31

PERSIUS
Saturae
1.60 366n78
5 352

PHILITAS
fr. 25 (Spanoudakis) 388–390

PHILODEMUS
On the Good King According to Homer 311–312

PINDAR
Fragments
29 (Maehler) 222n18
194 222n18
198a 223
Isthmian Odes
6.74–76 218n6
7 222n18
8.33–35 223n19
Nemean Odes
3.43–64 223n19
Olympian Odes
10.84–85 218n6
Pythian Odes
1.1–8 268n6
4.96–97 157n19

Pythian Odes (*cont.*)
4.156–167 157
4.196–204 144
5.63–69 267n5

Plato
Laws
741c 389n53
Republic
573a–b 279n42
575a 279n42
Symposium
213d 366

Pliny the Elder
Naturalis Historia
7.207 117n16
16.5 315n28
34.45 334n32

Pliny the Younger
Epistulae
4.3.3–5 330n16
5.3.2–3 375n14
6.22 331n18
9.17.3 283n56
Panegyricus
49.6 269n13
48.3–50 279n43
48.5 277n35
49.2 279n42

Plutarch
Caesar
41.2 262
Cato Minor
4 71n63
Cicero
26 335n40
Lucullus
41.2 269n13
Moralia
160E–162B 283n56
286A–C 41
327E–F 320n41
327F 312n15
328A–B 320–321n43
328C–329D 309n7
330D 323
330F 320n42
Numa
13.3 369n91
Pompey
67.3 262
Romulus
9.5–6 41

Polybius
Histories
10.3 315n28

Porcius Licinus
fr. 1 (Courtney) 306

Posidonius
87 F112 (Jacoby) 321n44

[Probus]
Ad Georgica
3.19 328n5

Propertius
Elegiae
2.3.1–12 240n9
2.3.10–12 236n4
2.25.3–4 329n11
2.28.29 246n25, 378n25
2.34.65–66 221
2.34.87–88 329n11
2.34.93–94 228–229
3.1.1–4 222, 290n4
3.1.3 366n77
3.1.35–36 219
3.2.17–26 293n22
3.3.41–42 218n5
4.1.57 219n10
4.1.63–68 220
4.6.32 284n62

Quintilian
Institutio Oratoria
1.5.20 329
1.10.14 283n55
6.3.45 341n63
10.1.58 331n17
10.1.96 329

Sallust
Catilina
5.3 17n23
13.3–4 17n23

Sappho
fr. 31 195

Scholia Ad Apollonium Rhodium
3.200 114n1

Scriptores Historiae Augustae
Tyranni Triginta
8.3 369n91

Seneca the Elder
Controuersiae
9.2 268n8, 274n22
Suasoriae
3.7 340

Seneca the Younger
De Beneficiis
1.13.2–3 299–300n47
1.13 310n10
2.16 310n10
3.31.1 315n28
7.2.5–6 310n10
De Clementia 310
1.9.1–1.11.3 314n23
Dialogi
3.1.2–4, 6 277n35
4.33.3–5.18.1 268n8
5.14.1–2 278n37
5.15.1 278n37
7.7.3 269–270n14
Epistulae Morales
82.4–5 298n42
86 311
91.17 310n10
94.62–63 310n10
Hercules Furens
809 19n30
Medea
238 38n18
301–379 115, 120
401–405 48n45
579–669 115, 120
703 19n30
720 139n13
757–759 48n45
Oedipus
470 243
611–612 283n57
957–958 277n35
Phaedra
483–558 121
Thyestes
446–470 201n13
908–919 279n42
993–995 335n41

Servius
Ad Aeneida
2.166 369n91
2.557 262
5.814–815 106
7.188 369n91
8.664 369n91
Ad Georgica
3.19 328n5

Silius Italicus
Punica
1.1–2 287, 297
1.244–246 17
1.481 277
2.414 378n26
2.494–505 274
3.162 14
3.172–173 14–15
3.298 378n26
3.580–581 274
3.590–629 308
3.594–595 314n23
3.614–615 263
4.115–119 315
4.326–330 59n31
4.396–400 293n17
4.425–427 308
4.454–471 315–316
4.476 302n62
4.525–528 292n15
4.638–699 311
6.122 294n25
6.653–697 294n25
7.1–33 251–252
7.11–19 257n22
7.19 261
7.70–72 261n55
7.113–130 252–254
7.113–114 262
7.116 261n55
7.121–122 291n7
7.154–158 17n22
7.157–211 263
7.194–196 301
7.213 254
7.252 261n52
7.282–287 17n22
7.306–307 252n4
7.351–366 256–257

Punica (*cont.*)
7.376 254n11, 257n25
7.398–400 261n53
7.401 261n55
7.437–493 317
7.438–470 283n61
7.494–514 251
7.536–565 261n52
7.563 257n22
7.565–750 251–252
7.596–597 255
7.705–706 257n22
7.717–722 254
7.746–750 264n69
8.134–139 27
8.209 26n53
8.240–241 253
8.253–256 218n8
8.593–594 252, 292
9.1–8 17n22
9.437 311
10.326–333 17n22
10.330–331 16n20
10.337–374 19
10.377–386 274
10.572–575 274
10.641–652 274
10.657–658 270
11.28–33 273
11.41–43 278n39
11.52–55 274, 281n51
11.130–133 276
11.148–154 276n34
11.160–164 276–277
11.183–184 277
11.190 276
11.194–200 281
11.218–221 277
11.247–261 277–278
11.270–300 275n26, 278–280, 282
11.303–368 271n19, 273
11.311 276
11.318–321 281
11.335–336 281
11.386–425 275–276
11.397–399 18–19
11.407–409 271, 282
11.429 281
11.434–446 282–283
11.439 271–272
11.449–458 280, 282–283
11.471 282
11.476–478 283n60
11.481–482 272, 284
11.511–512 218n8
11.542–611 273
11.574–576 284
11.592–597 284–285
12.387–419 252
12.387–389 291n10
12.390–414 306n3
12.393–419 291
12.390 303n64
12.411 297
12.558–564 17n22
13.94–381 278n36
13.100 275n33
13.388–392 316
13.445–487 301n55
13.494–516 301n55
13.517–518 323
13.613–649 301n55, 314–315
13.632–633 299n45
13.635 297
13.637–647 299
13.640 301
13.650–704 301n56
13.678–679 271, 302n56
13.696 302n56
13.707–716 302n57
13.732–751 302n58 and 59
13.752–754 289–290
13.762–775 314
13.762 297
13.763 302n62
13.767–768 297n37, 299, 302n62
13.770–774 299–300
13.776–777 290
13.778–797 252
13.778–791 312–313
13.778–785 296n34, 300
13.782–783 294n26, 296n30, 302
13.784–785 301
13.785–797 287–288, 291–292, 295–298
13.788 290n7
13.798–803 295–296
13.798 298n40
13.804–805 303n65
15.18–31 316
15.46–52 17–18, 275n32
15.59–72 319

15.71–83	298–299
15.77–100	318
15.92–97	269n14
15.98–102	300n48
15.101–107	298n42
15.109–112	18, 272n20, 275n32
15.119–120	275n32
15.123–127	269n14
15.125	319
15.275–276	298n40
15.328	294n26
15.455–456	252
16.277–284	322
16.649–699	322
17.629–654	323
17.645–650	264
17.647–652	299n45
17.651	295n26

Sophocles

Oedipus Coloneus

720–1043	203–205

Philoctetes

1–2	176

Statius

Achilleis

1.1–19	217–219
1.3–4	246
1.4–5	235
1.5	231n43
1.14–15	221
1.129	17n24
1.158–164	239–241
1.188–194	247n29
1.228–231	26n52
1.277–284	241
1.297	242
1.299–300	242n13
1.303–310	242–243
1.313–317	243
1.332–334	244
1.337	243
1.514–535	244
1.605–614	244
1.611	301n51
1.644	244
1.807–808	16n18
1.816–818	16–17
1.852–854	245
1.864–865	296n33
1.866	245
1.960	247n29
2.5–6	245
2.16	245n21
2.84–85	245
2.127	245
2.160	245

Siluae

1 *praef.* 2–4	231
1 *praef.* 7–9	373n4, 376
1.2.61	240n8
1.2.250	57
1.2.251	22n37
1.2.253	331n17
1.3.20–23	28
1.3.91–92	378n26
1.3.100	282n53
1.4.57	25n45
1.5	232
1.6.35–50	269n10
1.6.85–97	24–26
2.1.18	240n9
2.1.41	237n4, 240n9
2.1.117	246n25
2.2.7	25n45
2.2.131–132	298n42
2.3.6	25n45
2.6.65–66	378n26
2.7.9	301n51
2.7.24–35	220
2.7.36–37	344n77
3 *praef.* 8–10	230
3.1	345n3, 348–349
3.1.8–19	229–230
3.1.29	328n5
3.1.115–116	229–230
3.1.116–120	283
3.2.39–41	230–231
3.2.143	231
3.5.1–35	26n52
3.5.1–2	26–27
3.5.12–13	194
3.5.33–35	273
3.5.78–79	223
3.5.85–86	27
4.1.31–33	314n23
4.2.1–7	278n39
4.2.5–10	224n23
4.2.50–51	261
4.3	195
4.3.153–157	261, 263
4.3.155	302n62
4.4.51–55	28–29

Siluae (*cont.*)
4.5 195
4.5.4 282n53
4.5.13 19n30
4.6.12–14 25
4.6.18–16 27–28
4.6.20–24 327
4.6.47–49 367
4.6.51 328n5
4.7.1–28 194–196
4.7.5–8 221–222
4.7.26 231
4.9 195
5.1 345n3
5.3.10–11 198, 232, 297n35
5.3.19–28 196–197
5.3.26 246
5.3.33–40 198
5.3.99 57
5.3.104–111 223n20
5.3.124–132 219n12
5.3.133–177 194–198
5.3.146–161 246–247
5.3.194 284n63
5.3.209–216 199
5.3.233–234 229
5.4 14, 26
Thebais
1.3 231
1.9–15 230
1.9–10 283n57
1.15–33 193n2
1.33–37 218, 284
1.33 231
1.138–139 183
1.144–151 200–201
1.389 28n59
2.30–31 23n38
2.59–61 23n38
2.71–88 23–25
2.125–133 24
2.129 25n46
2.145–146 28n59
2.273–276 367
2.283–284 368n85
2.700 283n57
3.294 183n57
3.690 19n30
4.126–127 255
4.157–164 263
4.356–360 283
4.652–679 177n28, 178n36
4.668–669 179
4.677 185
4.692–698 179n42
4.752–771 187
4.785–786 188
4.823–830 352
5.36 184–185
5.49–499 186
5.49–56 176
5.57–59 130n53
5.195–201 14n10
5.241–242 14–15, 20n32
5.265–286 178n37
5.271–284 130n53
5.287–289 118
5.287 154n8
5.341–345 175
5.463–467 180n50
5.496 180n49
5.499 185n64
5.534–535 182n54
5.556–578 187
5.615–616 185n64
5.620–637 190
5.626–627 184
5.638–639 183
5.650–690 188–189, 191
5.658–675 183, 185n64
5.661–667 187
5.710–753 177–182
6.46–50 180
6.106 48n43
6.133–134 182n55
6.135–192 189
6.137 179n43
6.186 22n37
6.242–248 231n42
6.340–345 182n55
6.464–476 182n55
6.499–503 59n31
6.729–825 348n15
7.426 283n57
7.463–465 16n19
7.463 28n59
7.493–496 183n57
7.628–631 218n5
8.259–270 19–20
8.373–374 344n77
8.623–624 19n29
9.496–499 66n50
10.89 25n45
10.129 19n30

10.166–167 259
10.445–448 222n18, 258
10.446 282n53
10.628–825 205–208
10.800–801 183
11.457–458 258
11.484 25n46
10.786–788 230n40
11.673–747 202–203
11.692–698 205n17
11.748–752 205n17
12.150 19n30
12.222–446 26n52
12.228–231 26
12.354–361 26n52
12.499–539 210–212
12.642–646 211
12.811–812 231
12.814–815 217
12.814 190n80

STRABO
Geography
8.6.7 186n68
10.3.7 368n86

SUDA
Ἔννιος 291n10

SUETONIUS
Augustus
11 258n28
De Grammaticis
7 138n7
23 337n48
Domitian
3.1 343n74
Julius
50.1 262
Nero
31.1 334n32
Otho
7.1 160n31
Vespasianus
8.5 167n61
Vitellius
11.2 160n31

TACITUS
Annales
1.10.2 258n28
15.33.2 223
Dialogus De Oratoribus
10.4 375n14
Historiae
3.55 160
4.52 167n60, 61

TERENCE
Adelphoe
409 184n58

THEOCRITUS
Idylls
7.43–44 389n52
13.22–23 48n44
13.24 40n26
22 37n18

THEOPHRASTUS
Historia Plantarum
3.3.1 389

TIBULLUS
Elegiae
1.3.35–52 123

[TIBULLUS]
3.4.27–32 240
4.31–34 236n4

VALERIUS FLACCUS
Argonautica
1.1–21 154–156
1.1–4 47, 49n1
1.3 46, 162
1.4 36
1.16–21 47
1.22–57 139–141
1.23–64 157–158
1.26–30 127
1.38–39 159
1.39–50 124
1.40–66 127n45
1.59–60 162
1.64–78 141–142
1.71–80 129
1.71–73 140
1.91–95 123n39
1.92–93 145, 147n31
1.121–148 33–34
1.121–129 142–143
1.124 145n20, 147n31
1.127 35n8

Argonautica (*cont.*)

1.164	149
1.184–349	75–76
1.184	149
1.188–203	117n15
1.200–201	157
1.205–239	96
1.211–214	116
1.220	161
1.224–226	163
1.240	150, 167n59
1.250–296	267n2
1.272–273	38
1.274–285	24n42
1.276	117n14
1.296	167n59
1.303–304	36
1.303	34n5
1.349	120n30
1.471–472	283
1.477–480	34–35, 147–148
1.477–478	145n20
1.481	19n30
1.498–656	143–144
1.505–527	117n15
1.531–567	83
1.544–555	122
1.562–563	91
1.563–567	161
1.598–692	82–84
1.609–642	35n9
1.627–632	74, 116–117
1.630	162
1.637–638	48
1.649–650	133n60
1.700–709	128
1.723–724	128
1.741–745	125
1.742	130
1.744–751	78n32
1.759–770	129
1.763–766	76n16
1.770	120n30
1.788–822	76n16
1.812–814	130
2.17–33	161
2.64–65	154
2.82–134	130
2.98–142	79–80
2.108–109	117n16
2.113–114	74, 79, 131
2.115–215	131n54
2.144	87n89
2.154	87n89
2.156–159	131n56
2.158–160	80n43
2.244–246	293n16
2.285–287	117
2.285	154n8
2.323–325	162
2.328	132
2.349–353	27
2.357–377	51–56
3.367–371	69n55
2.368	147n29
2.369–373	81
2.381–382	162
2.385	54
2.391–392	53
2.408–417	184
2.445–578	148–151
2.445–446	117n14
2.454–549	164–165
2.468	167n59
2.473–492	158
2.550–578	158–159
2.579–582	24n42
2.581–582	25
2.587–629	78
2.646–650	132
2.647–648	91, 161
2.651–654	275n26
2.655–662	133
2.656–662	80
2.658	117n16
2.659–662	166
2.661	117n16
3.13–57	132–133
3.18–261	79–80
3.32–42	21
3.45	74, 79
3.76	19n30
3.290–313	134
3.352–356	133–134
3.362–461	81
3.430–434	58–59
3.432	60n35
3.553	91
3.621	162
4.25–53	78n32
4.60–81	165
4.66–67	162
4.69	41
4.85	283n59

4.99–343	85–87, 161–162
4.156	165
4.174–186	56–58
4.286	19n30
4.327–329	74
4.327	91n110
4.342–343	284
4.350–354	59n31
4.352	81
4.374–383	59–60
4.391–418	61–67
4.423–528	162
4.559–560	126
4.562–566	42
4.591–598	107–108
4.616–619	126
4.637–710	162–163
4.637	46n38
4.639–643	43
4.641	46n38
4.645	46n38
4.647	46
4.658–660	45–46
4.668	46n38
4.675–676	45–46
4.682–688	44–46
4.689–693	49n1
4.691–694	35–39, 42–43
4.692	46n38
5.1–224	100
5.1–62	87–89, 95–112
5.17–20	74
5.18–19	91
5.33–34	35
5.44	147n29
5.45–51	22
5.60	91
5.63–72	101
5.65–66	89n97
5.68–69	89n96
5.116	81
5.141	19n30
5.154–176	165
5.171–176	40
5.175–176	35
5.177–216	79
5.194–213	78
5.210–212	38n18
5.222–223	159
5.224–225	124, 157–158
5.233–240	78n32
5.236–237	113
5.251	134n63
5.259–275	113–114
5.264–265	163n45
5.265–272	69–70
5.326	91n109
5.408–454	159
4.452–454	163–164
5.474	81
5.486–488	158
5.519–541	159
5.534–546	114
5.534–541	160
5.536	135
5.543–546	166
5.549–617	89–92
5.550–552	74
5.596–599	51n9, 69n55
5.603	19n30
5.609–612	69n55
5.624–648	79, 134n63
5.682	81
6.1–426	79–81
6.18–30	135
6.18–20	70
6.29	74, 79
6.45–46	163
6.231–233	114n1
6.317–370	70
6.323–342	134
6.323–329	51n9, 69
6.548	160
6.593	160
6.723–751	114
6.736	91
6.752–760	26n52
7.1–27	26n52
7.9	19n30
7.32–102	159
7.61–77	160
7.92	158
7.254–258	51n9, 68–69
7.260–262	117n16
7.341	19n30
7.359	41
7.400–406	51n9, 70–71
7.420–423	70
8.56–63	49n1
8.109–126	49n1, 54
8.178–194	83n62
8.194	39
8.202	14n11
8.248–251	163–164

Argonautica (*cont.*)
8.259–260 182n54
8.385–407 90n102
8.389–394 51n9, 67–68

Valerius Maximus
Facta et Dicta Memorabilia
5.4.2 315n28
8.14.1 291n10

Varro
De Lingua Latina
6.49 369n91

Venantius Fortunatus
2.139–146 57n24

Virgil
Aeneis
1.1–4 64–65
1.8–11 65
1.50–156 82
1.162 177
1.183 280n48
1.259–260 298
1.305 14n9
1.337 177
1.360–364 128
1.427–429 177
1.446–493 143
1.453–457 294–295
1.488–493 294n24
1.495 295
1.588–589 301n52
1.590–592 238n5
1.657 275n25
1.725–730 275n26
1.731–734 279n46
1.740–747 267n2, 280
1.749 242
2.35–39 280n48
2.54–56 270n15
2.56 257n22
2.307–308 257
2.533–558 253
2.542 245n22
2.590 301n52
3.154–171 78n31
3.169 257n22
3.462 292, 297
3.497–498 296n31
4.2 275n27
4.66 275n28
4.77 275n29
4.86–89 275n31
4.101 275n28
4.193 275n30
4.260–265 275n31, 276n33
4.361–5.34 128
4.469–473 177
4.597 278
5.319 257n25
5.814–815 105–107
5.835–871 21
6.174 106
6.176–182 109–111
6.183–211 110
6.212–235 108–111
6.296 108n46
6.347–371 104n36
6.381 108
6.662–668 312n19
6.679–683 312
6.791–800 314
6.801–805 263
6.806 297
6.851 342
6.860–869 296
7.1–45 100
7.1–7 106
7.341–407 131n54
7.372 94
7.446–466 64–66
7.566–570 108n46
7.601–604 51
7.781–792 63–67
8.59 257n22
8.113 117n15
8.151 260n42
8.198 260
8.200–204 260n42
8.219–267 164
8.244–246 260n42
8.285–302 86
8.301 302n62
8.319–327 123
8.440 367n84
8.558–584 75–76 andn13, n. 16
8.643 270
9.59–64 254
9.165–175 23
9.446–449 293
9.576 280n48
9.598–620 134

9.717–777 254
10.143–145 280n48
10.215–218 20n33
10.241 257n22
10.270–277 63, 277n35
11.263 367n84
11.492–497 241n11
11.901 254
12.3–9 66
12.4–8 255
12.64–69 237–238
12.67 242
12.107–109 68
12.236–238 53
12.327 254n11
12.851–853 210
12.898 257n22
12.951 66

Eclogae
1.2 342n72
1.4–5 53
4.6 123
4.18–20 122n34
4.31–35 122n34, 134n64
6 357
6.1–2 290n4
6.4–5 362
6.8 342n72
6.31–40 280n47
8.9–10 294

Georgica
1.1–42 155–156
1.121–146 121n32, 123
1.129–138 156n14, 165n52
1.136 48n43
1.424–433 50–51
1.425 57
1.427 53
2.173–176 220n16
2.176 290n4, 294n25
2.470 27n56
3.3–4 351–352
3.10–48 293n22
3.10–20 220
3.10–12 290n4
3.37 367n81
3.68 164
3.461–463 243
3.478 164
3.482–483 259
3.566 259
4.389 165
4.523 283n60

XENOPHANES
fr. 1.21–23 336

XENOPHON
Memorabilia
2.1.21–34 316n32

ZONARAS
Epitome
8.23 315n28